

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 4110. A bill to provide a pension for Mrs. James Gardiner Conroy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 4111. A bill for the relief of Louis Beckham; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4659. By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of A. V. McKernan, P. J. Hanley, J. A. Bruno, D. Scanlon, Charles Carney, Louise Carney, John G. Wiggins, J. J. Buckley, William Ahern, Thomas Ellett, Joseph Fitzsimmons, William J. Goldback, and H. O. McCoy, protesting against the enactment of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4660. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of Julius Meltzer and about 4,000 other citizens, requesting the Members of Congress to do everything in their power by their vote and their action to pass the soldier vote bill which will allow the Federal Government to make it easily possible for all men and women in the armed services to vote; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President and Representatives in Congress.

4661. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 175 persons of the College Hill Reformed Presbyterian Church, Beaver Falls, Pa., favoring the establishment of a Christian world order; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4662. Also, petition of 30 members of the R. W. Redpath Missionary Society of Beaver Falls, Pa., favoring the establishment of a Christian world order; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4663. By Mr. HALE: Petition of the Methodist Church of Cape Porpoise, Maine, opposing isolationism and favoring international collaboration for enduring peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4664. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Bessie M. Hubbs and other residents of Onondaga County, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4665. By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia: Memorial of the Norfolk (Va.) Junior Chamber of Commerce protesting against wartime prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4666. By Mr. WARD JOHNSON: Three petitions sent in by Alice Drought, of Long Beach (4), Calif., favoring support of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4667. Also, 42 petitions sent in by Rev. Winfield Edson, of the First Baptist Church, Long Beach, Calif., and signed by members of his congregation, urging the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4668. Also, petition sent in by Rev. Victor Hourez of the Second Foursquare Church, North Long Beach, Calif., and signed by members of his congregation and friends in support of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4669. Also, two petitions sent in by Rev. C. E. Shipp, of the Garfield Baptist Church, Long Beach (6), Calif., and signed by members of his congregation, favoring support of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4670. Also, two petitions sent in by C. B. Warner, of Long Beach (4), Calif., urging the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4671. Also, two petitions sent in by Rev. Lawrence V. Lucas, of Grace Methodist Church, Long Beach, Calif., and signed by

members of his congregation, favoring support of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4672. Also, two petitions sent in by Rev. C. E. Miller, of the Methodist Church, of Hynes, Calif., and signed by members of his congregation, favoring support of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4673. Also, two petitions sent in by Alice Drought and signed by members of the First Brethren Church, of Long Beach, Calif., favoring support of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4674. Also, three petitions sent in by Alice Drought and signed by members of the Church of Our Saviour, Long Beach, Calif., favoring support of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the committee on the Judiciary.

4675. Also, four petitions sent in by H. S. Putnam, of the Methodist Church, Long Beach, Calif., and signed by members of his congregation, favoring support of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4676. Also, five petitions sent in by Hazel G. Neal, pastor, Community Church of God, Long Beach (4), Calif., and signed by members of her congregation in support of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4677. Also, five petitions sent in by Rev. A. G. Downing, of the Immanuel Baptist Church, Long Beach, Calif., and signed by members of his congregation, favoring support of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4678. Also, six petitions sent in by Rev. Frank D. Lawyer, of the East Long Beach Methodist Church, Long Beach, Calif., and signed by members of his congregation, favoring support of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4679. Also, seven petitions sent in by Rev. Ralph W. Lee, of the Atlantic Methodist Church, Long Beach, Calif., and signed by members of his congregation, favoring support of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4680. Also, seven petitions sent in by Rev. Clifford F. Jones, of the Bellflower Community Presbyterian Church, Bellflower, Calif., and signed by members of his congregation, favoring support of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4681. Also, 13 petitions sent in by Rev. Louis S. Bauman, pastor of the First Brethren Church, Long Beach, Calif., and signed by members of his congregation, favoring support of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4682. Also, 17 petitions sent in by Dr. P. Hopper, of the First Presbyterian Church, Long Beach, Calif., and signed by members of his congregation, favoring support of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4683. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Independent American Labor Party Club of Mount Vernon, N. Y., urging the formation of a House Interracial Affairs Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

4684. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the American Labor Party of New York State, favoring support of the Green-Lucas soldier vote bill; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4685. Also, petition of the New York Printing-Pressmen's Union, No. 51, urging adoption of the Green-Lucas soldier vote bill; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4686. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Jewish Educational Society of San Francisco, Calif., relative to the abrogation of the White Paper and establishing a Jewish homeland in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4687. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of approximately 800 citizens of the State of Maine, members of the Textile Workers Union of America, and others, urging immediate enactment of a Federal soldier vote bill, and adequate funds and authority to subsidize food; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4688. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city clerk, city of Trenton, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Palestine as a Jewish homeland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4689. Also, petition of the secretary-general manager, Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, Fort Worth, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the distribution of protein feeds to the distressed areas of Texas and adjoining States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, January 24, 1944)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee for the sweet refreshment of sleep, restoring the frayed edges of care, and for the beckoning glory and the fresh vigor of the new day. Across all its tolling hours, O Thou great Companion of our souls, keep our hearts with Thee as once more we set our faces toward vexing social problems which tax our utmost to solve.

May we take heed of all the judgments of those who share with us the responsibilities of statecraft and gather gratefully and patiently whatever truth they hold; but teach us still to test all things by our own conscience and by the words and the spirit of that One who alone is our Master. Strengthen our weakness, comfort our sorrow, steady and calm our anxious hearts, quiet our ill tempers, bring courage for cowardice and faith for cynicism, and in the decisions here to be made in crucial days ahead make us worthy of these demanding times that call aloud for wisdom and character. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, February 2, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. CLARK of Idaho). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Overton
Andrews	Gillette	Pepper
Austin	Green	Radcliffe
Bailey	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barkley	Hawkes	Robertson
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Smith
Bridges	Jackson	Stewart
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Buck	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lodge	Tobey
Byrd	Lucas	Truman
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Walgren
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Mead	Walsh, N. J.
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Downey	Murdock	White
Eastland	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Nye	Willis
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wilson
George	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR VAN NUYS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, with respect to the recent death of our distinguished colleague, Senator FREDERICK VAN NUYS, of Indiana, I desire to observe that the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which he was a very able and industrious member for a number of years, has adopted a resolution in tribute to him. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD in the form in which it passed the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Committee on Foreign Relations has learned with profound sorrow of the death of its distinguished member, FREDERICK VAN NUYS; and

Whereas Senator VAN NUYS served with outstanding ability on the Committee on Foreign Relations for 10 years, a period during which he provided wise counsel to his country and exerted a potent and beneficent influence on the role America has played in world affairs;

Whereas Senator VAN NUYS, by his constructive accomplishments, integrity, and personal example, has left a brilliant record that will guide his aggrieved colleagues in the difficult days to come;

Whereas in the death of Senator VAN NUYS the United States has lost a foremost statesman and public servant: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we tender to Mrs. Van Nuys, the widow of our late colleague, our deepest

sympathy in her great bereavement; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be inscribed in the minutes of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and a copy be sent to Mrs. Van Nuys.

REPORT OF NAVY CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the national commandant and the national ships writer of the Navy Club of the United States of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings and activities and statement of receipts and expenditures, etc., of that club for 1943, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress to adopt legislation, expeditiously, which will leave to the States the responsibility of providing the form of absentee ballots and all provisions for tabulation of the vote and which will provide for Federal action only in the delivery, collection, and return of the ballots; ordered to lie on the table.

(See joint resolution printed in full in today's proceedings when presented by Mr. HAWKES.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the adoption of measures to help the destitute, ill, and hospitalized children of Nazi-occupied Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GREEN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"Joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations endorsing the broad principles of world relations as announced by the Moscow Conference implemented by the successive conferences of the Allied Powers

"Whereas the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, early refuge for the persecuted who wished only freedom to think as they pleased and to speak as they thought, in article I of her constitution declared that all free governments are instituted for the protection, safety, and happiness of the people and has held forth a lively experiment that a flourishing civil state can stand and be best maintained with full liberty in religious concerns; and

"Whereas the broad principles of world relations as announced by the Moscow Conference, implemented by the successive conferences of the Allied Powers, have particular significance to the descendants of those who fought to secure religious and political freedom for this smallest State in the Union: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, firmly convinced that the broad principles of world relations as so announced by the Moscow Conference and so implemented, should receive the ready endorsement of every citizen of this liberty-loving State, does now express to the Honorable Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, to the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State of the United States, who so ably represented the United States at the Moscow Conference, and to the

Senators and Representatives in Congress from Rhode Island such endorsement without reservation that there may be political base for international cooperation and economic base for international trade and development, two underlying necessities for a post-war world; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of State of Rhode Island to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States and the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States of America that they may be entirely cognizant of the approval of Rhode Island of the plan for the broad principles of world relations, as evidenced in the Moscow Conference, so implemented."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1835. A bill for the relief of Frederick Lee Littlefield; with amendments (Rept. No. 660).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1934. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Donald B. Johnston; without amendment (Rept. No. 661); and

H. R. 2691. A bill for the relief of Tom S. Steed; without amendment (Rept. No. 662).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 891. A bill for the relief of Rebecca Collins and W. W. Collins; with amendments (Rept. No. 663);

H. R. 547. A bill for the relief of Kernan R. Cunningham; without amendment (Rept. No. 664);

H. R. 3001. A bill for the relief of James T. Rogers; without amendment (Rept. No. 665);

H. R. 3329. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse; without amendment (Rept. No. 666); and

H. R. 3332. A bill for the relief of Spencer Meeks; without amendment (Rept. No. 667).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1549. A bill for the relief of Vern M. Stanchfield; without amendment (Rept. No. 668);

S. 1563. A bill for the relief of W. E. Dowdell and June Dowdell; with an amendment (Rept. No. 669);

H. R. 610. A bill for the relief of Pacific Dry Dock and Repair Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 670);

H. R. 2639. A bill for the relief of William M. Tucker and Nelda M. Tucker; without amendment (Rept. No. 671);

I. R. 2804. A bill for the relief of Ruth E. P. Phillips, as executrix of the estate of Amos Russell Phillips, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 672); and

H. R. 3157. A bill for the relief of Lloyd L. Johnson and P. B. Hume; with an amendment (Rept. No. 673).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

S. 1387. A bill to extend the time within which the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River; without amendment (Rept. No. 674).

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1632. A bill for the relief of Capt. S. E. McCarty (Supply Corps), United States Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 675);

S. 1647. A bill to amend the act approved March 2, 1895, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 676);

S. 1653. A bill to provide titles for heads of staff departments of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 677);

S. 1668. A bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 678);

S. 1676. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Richard Shaker, United States Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 679);

S. 1677. A bill for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt. A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire occurring on August 11, 1943, in quarters occupied by him in the armory of Aviation Free Gun-nery Unit, Dam Neck, Va.; without amend-ment (Rept. No. 680); and

S. 1681. A bill to provide for reimburse-ment of certain Marine Corps personnel at-tached to Marine Utility Squadron 152 for personal property lost or damaged as the re-sult of a fire in officers' quarters on February 9, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 681).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on Feb-ruary 1, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1543) to provide for mustering-out payments to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes.

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES: NUMBER OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, DECEMBER 1943

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unan- imous consent to present a report in connection with the work of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures on the number of civilian employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of December 1943.

The reduction trend in Federal civilian employment continues, there being a total of 2,960,936 employees for the month of December 1943, which is a reduction of 13,066 employees over the total of 2,974,002 for the month of November 1943.

There has also been a net decrease of 134,527 employees since the month of June 1943, when civilian employment in the executive branch reached the peak figure of 3,095,463.

Since November 1943, 33 departments and agencies have eliminated 18,166 em- ployees while 28 departments and agen- cies have increased the number of their employees by 5,100.

Except for the Navy Department with an increase of 1,799 employees and the Veterans' Administration with an in- crease of 338 employees, there were no increases for any department or agency of over 300 employees.

The War Department continues its reduction trend with a decrease of 13,368 employees. Other departments and agencies showing substantial reductions in the number of their employees were: Department of Agriculture, 1,237; Ten- nessee Valley Authority, 936; Depart- ment of Justice, 598; Federal Works Agency, 460; and the War Manpower Commission, 347, which is due in part to the liquidation of the National Youth Administration.

I ask that the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal civilian employment, by department and agency, for months of November and December 1943, showing increases and decreases in number of paid employees

Department or agency	Novem-ber	Decem-ber	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Office of the President.....	578	1,559	-19
State Department.....	8,497	8,607	+110
Treasury Department.....	85,852	86,127	+275
War Department.....	1,228,482	1,215,114	-13,368
Justice Department.....	30,191	29,593	-598
Post Office Department.....	350,982	251,081	+99
Navy Department.....	706,857	708,656	+1,799
Interior Department.....	38,824	38,755	-69
Agriculture Department.....	82,427	81,190	-1,237
Commerce Department.....	31,447	31,353	-94
Labor Department.....	5,909	6,176	+267
NATIONAL WAR AGENCIES			
Committee on Fair Em- ployment Practice.....	103	18	-85
Division of Central Ad- ministrative Services.....	4,641	4,480	-161
National War Labor Board.....	3,082	3,176	+94
Office of Alien Property Custodian.....	1,039	1,027	-12
Office of Civilian Defense.....	1,048	998	-50
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.....	1,339	1,339	0
Office of Defense Trans- portation.....	5,045	5,006	-39
Office of Economic Stabi- lization.....	7	9	+2
Office of Scientific Re- search and Develop- ment.....	1,112	1,146	+34
Office of War Information.....	5,008	5,225	+217
Office of War Mobilization.....	15	20	+5
Smaller War Plants Cor- poration.....	1,605	1,565	-40
War Production Board.....	17,266	17,979	+713
War Manpower Commis- sion.....	25,129	24,782	-347
Selective Service System.....	23,758	23,613	-145
War Relocation Authority.....	1,943	1,867	-76
War Shipping Administra- tion.....	4,395	4,522	+127
Foreign Economic Admin- istration.....	6,257	6,197	-60
Office of Censorship.....	12,165	12,120	-45
Office of Price Administra- tion.....	55,061	55,280	+219
Office of Strategic Services.....	1,622	1,692	+70
Petroleum Administrator for War.....	1,422	1,412	-10
INDEPENDENT ESTABLISH- MENTS			
American Battle Monu- ments Commission.....	1	1	0
Board of Investigation and Research, transportation.....	79	79	0
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	320	329	+9
Civil Service Commission.....	6,855	6,972	+117
Employees Compensation Commission.....	532	523	-9
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	60	59	-1
Federal Communications Commission.....	2,200	2,194	-6
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1,088	1,077	-11
Federal Power Commis- sion.....	672	670	-2
Federal Security Agency.....	31,189	30,889	-300
Federal Trade Commis- sion.....	463	455	-8
Federal Works Agency.....	21,968	21,508	-460
General Accounting Office.....	10,553	10,651	+98
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,157	2,174	+17
Maritime Commission.....	9,475	9,599	+124
National Advisory Com- mission for Aeronautics.....	4,456	4,630	+174
National Archives.....	338	348	+10
National Capital Housing Authority.....	273	264	-9
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	17	18	+1
National Gallery of Art.....	261	261	0
National Housing Agency.....	20,709	20,817	+108
National Labor Relations Board.....	759	743	-16
National Mediation Board.....	86	81	-5
Panama Canal.....	33,156	33,175	+19
Railroad Retirement Board.....	1,536	1,512	-24
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	7,778	7,825	+47
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	1,243	1,231	-12
Smithsonian Institution.....	421	427	+6

See footnotes at end of table.

Federal civilian employment, by department and agency, for months of November and December 1943, showing increases and decreases in number of paid employees—Con.

Department or agency	Novem-ber	Decem-ber	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
INDEPENDENT ESTABLISH- MENTS—continued			
Tariff Commission.....	303	301	-2
Tax Court of the United States.....	124	125	+1
Tennessee Valley Author- ity.....	25,097	24,161	-936
Veterans' Administration.....	46,725	47,063	+338
Total.....	2,974,002	2,960,936	+5,100 -18,166
Net decrease.....			-13,066

¹ Bureau of the Budget only. National Resources Planning Board, formerly included, abolished December 1943.

² Does not include about 220,000 Christmas-rush tem- porary employees.

³ Includes 10,324 employees of stations in the hands of the enemy.

⁴ Includes 771 cotton agents paid seasonally.

⁵ Increase due to 796 without-compensation and dollar- per-annum employees not previously reported.

⁶ Includes Training Within Industry and U. S. Em- ployment Service. Also includes the National Youth Administration, which was ordered liquidated by Dec. 31, 1943. Does not include the Selective Service System.

⁷ Partly estimated.

NOTE.—Employment figures now reported to the com- mittee include dollar-per-annum employees and without- compensation employees of the consultant-expert type who are allowed per diem in lieu of subsistence.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were intro- duced, read the first time, and, by unani- mous consent, the second time, and re- ferred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1687. A bill for the relief of Samuel C. Sparks (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. BUSHFIELD (for himself, Mr. NYE, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. WHERRY) introduced Senate bill 1688, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 1689. A bill for the relief of W. E. Dow- dell and June Dowdell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1690. A bill to further amend the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942; and

S. 1691. A bill to amend section 406 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruc- tion at the United States Military Academy at West Point, Alexander Firouz, a citizen of Iran; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

READJUSTMENT OF INDEBTEDNESS IN CONNECTION WITH SEED AND FEED LOANS

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Sen- ator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from Nebras- ka [Mr. WHERRY], I introduce a bill for appropriate reference for the purpose of adjusting, through the Farm Credit Cor-

poration, seed and feed loans in the grain-growing States.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1688) to authorize the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain indebtedness, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUSHFIELD (for himself, Mr. NYE, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. WHERRY) was received and read twice by its title.

Mr. BUSHFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with the bill which I introduced earlier in the day, if there is any doubt in the mind of the parliamentarian or the Acting President pro tempore, as to its reference, I suggest that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the bill being referred as requested?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I inquire what the bill is.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. It is a bill for readjustment of the administration of seed and feed loans.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. FERGUSON. I offer an amendment to Senate bill 1612, providing a wartime method of voting by members of the armed forces, now pending before the Senate, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table. The amendment comes on page 29 of the pending measure. In effect it provides a change in the language of the bill, so that an individual may not vote by party, but would be compelled to write in the names of the respective candidates for whom he is voting.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. DANAHER and Mr. McCLELLAN each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 1612) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TRUMAN BEFORE TRAFFIC CLUB OF BALTIMORE

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator TRUMAN before the Traffic Club of Baltimore, Md., on February 1, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN SPIRIT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The American Spirit," delivered by him before the annual merchandising school and sales show of the Wisco Hardware Co., Madison, Wis., January 24, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

POWER TRUST MENACES LABOR—ARTICLE BY SENATOR BONE

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Power Trust Menaces Labor," written by Senator BONE, and published in the International Teamster for February 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

INFLATION AND SUBSIDIES—LETTER BY PETER ZIMMERMAN

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject of inflation and subsidies, written by Peter Zimmerman, of Yamhill, Oreg., and published in the Portland Oregonian of January 30, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an extract from a speech delivered by Lord Beaverbrook in the House of Lords on January 19, 1944, dealing with the question of international civil aviation. I should not wish this extract to be considered as expressing my own views but merely as a document of very great importance which has not previously been brought to the attention of the American public.

There being no objection, the extract from the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are ready at any moment to enter into an international conference. I cannot tell you when it will take place. But in our view, when the time comes, our first concern will be to gain general acceptance of certain broad principles whereby civil aviation can be made into a benign influence for welding the nations of the world together into a closer cooperation. These principles must assure to all countries a free and fair share in this new means of transportation. No nation, great or small, except, of course, the guilty aggressor nations, must be debarred from taking a full and equitable part in the upsurging development of civil aviation that will follow the end of the war. It will be our aim to make civil aviation a guaranty of international solidarity, a mainstay of the world's peace. Of course, there are vital issues on which it will be necessary for the great powers to reach preliminary agreement. We are ready for such discussions at any time. At present we are waiting on the Americans to complete their surveys.

In particular, the question of bases has been widely canvassed. We have many bases at our disposal. They are scattered all over the Empire, and in other lands, too, the needs of war have caused us to construct airfields suitable for peace as well as for war. I do not, of course, deal today with the bases in the Dominions. These are necessarily separately dealt with, but they must and will be a subject for discussion between Great Britain and the Dominions. But, as for the bases under our control, let me say at once that the Government has no desire to exclude aircraft of other nations. We demand no prescriptive right to the use of airfields for ourselves. Rather do we mean to use them for the purpose of steadily developing civil aviation throughout the world. Here it must be said that the bases are few in number at which any great volume of traffic can be collected. Just the same, it will be necessary to have international agreement on traffic regulations and arrangements. This is an essential condition of future developments. For my part, I find myself on this subject in agreement with Mr. William Burden, of the Department of Commerce in Washington. Mr. Burden, speaking in Washington on the 5th of January, said:

"Complete freedom of the air in the present state of the world might result in commercial anarchy."

I share Mr. Burden's view. For our part, we are prepared and ready at any time to enter into negotiations with a view to disposing of all traffic problems and arrangements that will arise.

Now the President has recently made certain proposals for the future of international civil aviation. He has declared for the right of innocent passage for all nations throughout the world and for the right to land anywhere for refueling and other non-traffic purposes. And I am now authorized by the Prime Minister to say that we join with the President to the fullest extent in subscribing to these principles. I repeat the principles: The right of innocent passage for all nations throughout the world, and the right to land anywhere for refueling and other nontraffic purposes.

I am asked by some noble lords to state what is the future policy of the Government, and I will state it here. It is our intention that the Government shall take a full measure of responsibility for the development of civil aviation when the war comes to an end. That will be our right and our duty, and to the performance of the task we shall bring the vast knowledge of the air and of the airplane which Great Britain has acquired.

THE OIL SITUATION

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, a few days ago, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and I introduced a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 110) to liquidate and dissolve the Petroleum Reserves Corporation. As stated at the time of the introduction of the joint resolution, three reasons impelled our action in this connection.

First, the legality of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation is doubtful. The Petroleum Reserves Corporation was set up under an amendment to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, to engage this Nation permanently in all phases of the business of producing, transporting, refining, and marketing of petroleum and petroleum products as a part of our post-war economy, which is contrary to the spirit and purpose of the statute. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act was designed and enacted by Congress for the purpose of permitting the organization of corporate agencies deemed necessary for the purchase or manufacture and transportation of critical war materials for the national defense.

Secondly, the participation of the Government in foreign oil operations dedicates us to a policy of imperialism that is a violation of the principles of law and tradition on which this Government was founded and on which it has so gloriously prospered.

Thirdly, the Petroleum Reserves Corporation will engage this country in the field of private trade and commerce, and thus embark us upon a policy which will impede and eventually destroy the private enterprise of our own nationals which has been the basic framework that has made this the greatest industrial nation on the face of the earth.

Now, having briefly stated the reasons which impelled the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 110, let us look at the situation a little more closely and discuss it in some detail.

Can there be any convincing argument against our contention that the participation of the Government in foreign oil operations dedicates us to a policy of imperialism, and that such a policy of imperialism is contrary to the principles of law and tradition on which the Government was founded? I think not. Can we avoid the conclusion that if we embrace this imperialistic policy, our Government will be looked upon with suspicion and fear by other governments, and that it will inevitably lead to entangling alliances and international conflicts which will be the breeding ground for future wars? I believe such a conclusion is inescapable. There is a vast difference between the ownership of industrial and commercial rights by the nationals of this country within the boundaries of other countries and the ownership of those rights directly by this Government. To be sure, it is the obligation of this Nation to furnish to our nationals abroad every legitimate diplomatic protection which can be afforded, but controversies which may arise between our nationals and another country do not involve national honor or integrity as would be the case in a controversy between sovereign nations.

The British Empire has been cited as a smart oil operator which has acquired large reserves in foreign countries. In this connection, I want to call attention to the popular myth concerning British, French, and Dutch ownership of oil interests throughout the world. In a recent American magazine article, Mr. Ickes, the Petroleum Administrator for War, Secretary of the Interior, President of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, and the head of some two dozen other governmental agencies, said:

Great Britain has been much smarter and more forehanded than the United States in acquiring oil reserves in all parts of the globe. Nation and industry have worked together understandingly on the principle that what is best for the industry is best for the nation, and vice versa. With virtually no oil of her own and little coal to spare for producing it synthetically, she has rustled into the world outside, and, hand in hand with her nationals, acquired interests in petroleum fields wherever she could. The French Government has taken an analogous interest in the petroleum properties of French companies. So has the Netherlands Government. As a matter of fact, we are one of the few countries I know of that have not had the foresight to protect against the future. British oil companies have staked out valuable interests in various oil fields of the world. Every British company is touched with a national interest. The British oilman and his country are interdependent, and they both know it. As a matter of fact, the British Government owns an actual stock interest as high as 50 percent in some of the corporations that exploit the oil. This is, in effect, a life-insurance policy under which both are beneficiaries.

The fact is, Mr. Ickes did not know what he was talking about. The British Empire does not directly own a single barrel of oil reserves within the boundaries of any foreign country. The British Government does own a stock interest in the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., but this is the only case in which the British Gov-

ernment owns or controls any oil interest, and is the exception rather than the rule. It is not true, as stated by Mr. Ickes, that every British company is touched with a national interest. Not only is the stock interest in the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. the only oil interest owned by the British Empire, but it is a recognized national policy of long standing that the Government shall not participate in the management of that corporation. In a report of the Federal Trade Commission on foreign ownership in the petroleum industry, dated February 12, 1923, quoting from a memorandum of the British Foreign Office to the British Ambassador to the United States, concerning the ownership and management of the Anglo-Persian Oil Co., predecessor of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., it is specifically stated that the British Government "does not interfere with the company's commercial policy in any way."

With respect to the Netherlands, Mr. Ickes' statement is equally misleading. The Netherlands Government has no stock interest in the Royal Dutch Shell, nor any participating interest in any of that company's foreign operations, nor does it own directly or indirectly any petroleum reserves. France has nowhere in the world developed oil resources of any importance. French interests hold a minority participation in the Iraq Petroleum Co., but the French have nowhere been successful pioneers in the field of oil development.

For some time our neighbors who have been watching our internal activities and our expanding world paternalism, have undoubtedly been fearful of just such encroaching moves by this country as are exemplified by the formation of Petroleum Reserves Corporation. In Mexico, Venezuela, and Colombia, for example, companies with government stockholders are forbidden by law to explore for, acquire, or operate petroleum reserves. The people of those countries feel very strongly on the subject. For another country in its own right, or as a stockholder in a corporation, to acquire natural-resource interests, is looked upon as an invasion of their country and the beginning of the end of their national existence. Even if certain countries are willing today to permit our Government to own such rights in their countries, this can hardly be a satisfactory showing that such policy is not dangerous for the future peace of the world. On the contrary, such action is only evidence that they hope to have the United States support their countries by money gifts during peace and by a show of arms against outside threats, implied or actual, because of ownership by our Government of valuable property within their borders.

The action of Petroleum Reserves Corporation has until recently been shrouded in a great deal of mystery. From information recently made public, it appears that the immediate action of the Corporation is directed toward the Middle East, particularly the Persian Gulf area of the Kingdoms of Arabia and Iran and the territory of Kuwait. In recent weeks, geologists and other technical experts representing the Petroleum Reserves

Corporation are reported to have been in the Middle East for the purpose of making a survey, to the end that the Corporation may obtain a foothold in that area. According to the New York Times of Friday, January 28, Petroleum Reserves Corporation has plans for the erection of 2 refinery units in Egypt, with the combined capacity of 600,000 barrels a day, together with over 3,000 miles of pipe lines extending into the producing areas of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Iraq. This program, according to the report, is to be backed up with a drilling campaign in certain of the fields feeding the Egyptian refineries. Lying between Kuwait and Arabia is an area known as the neutral zone. The ownership of this area is in dispute between the 2 countries. It is understood that this is also one of the areas in which the Corporation is considering the possibility of acquiring reserves. What international complications this particular transaction may involve this country in would be hard to say.

Undoubtedly, if this country pursues the program contemplated by the charter powers of Petroleum Reserves Corporation, it will be the motivating force that will cause other nations to enter into the oil business, resulting in governments competing directly with each other for trade and commerce, with the consequent international complications.

But more fundamental even than these considerations, and more fraught with danger to the welfare of our country and our people, is the fact that the policy sought to be developed under the Petroleum Reserves Corporation of engaging this country in the field of private trade and commerce will impede and eventually destroy the private enterprise of our own nationals which is the foundation of this, the greatest industrial nation on the face of the earth.

Less than 3 years ago this Nation had hardly commenced to think of war; but starting from scratch we are today, because of our ability in the field of mass production, turning out more war materials and equipment than all of our allies combined. In the meantime, we have assembled and equipped an army—the best and finest the world has ever known. We have built the mightiest two-ocean navy that has ever plowed the seven seas, and we are sending a constant stream of supplies and equipment to every fighting front on the globe. How has this miracle of production been possible? It is attributable directly to the native genius of our people educated in the tradition of private enterprise—that enterprise which the White House "palace guards," who call themselves the "planners" of our economy, would now strike down and destroy. Not long ago Mr. Ickes, in one of his numerous magazine articles, had the effrontery to suggest that the consummation of our tremendous production program could not be credited to business and businessmen of this country but to the dictating of the *dictocrats*.

The organization of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation is just another of

many assaults upon the oil industry. Ever since the socialistic and communistic-minded New Dealers took over, they have had their eyes on the oil industry as one of the choice plums to be picked. The first major effort was the Federal oil and gas conservation bill, on which the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House conducted extensive hearings in 1934. The bill died in committee. Again, in 1939, a second attempt was made to enact oil-control legislation, known as the Cole bill. Extensive hearings were held by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House during 1939 and 1940, but due to the energetic defense of the oil industry and the help of the States this assault failed, and the bill was never reported out of committee. With the coming of war, however, the bureaucrats seized what they deemed to be their opportunity to grab off the oil industry and immediately proposed, by way of companion bills in the House and Senate, the organization of a half-billion-dollar corporation, known as the War Petroleum Corporation, with Mr. Ickes as president, and with charter powers to engage this country in every phase of the oil business, from production to marketing. The proposal did not get out of either the House or Senate committees.

Now we have the back-door approach under cover of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, by the organization of Petroleum Reserves Corporation. There has been considerable stage setting for embarking this country upon the perilous venture of Government ownership and operation of the oil business. Since we entered the war, the national policy has been to emphasize the virtues of foreign development, promotion of propaganda that we are running out of oil at home, and the restraining of operations in the United States. Nearly everything that could be done to prevent expansion of our own resources has been done. As a prelude to engaging this country in the oil business abroad and later at home, it was felt necessary to create, so far as possible, an artificial shortage of petroleum and petroleum products. This has been accomplished by a conspiracy of the "economy planners" to freeze and maintain the price of crude oil at levels relatively lower than other domestically produced natural resources. The price of crude oil was frozen as of October 1, 1941. On that date the weighted average price of crude oil was approximately \$1.20 per barrel, which was approximately the same weighted average price for which it was selling on October 1, 1937. On October 1, 1941, crude-oil prices were approximately 59 percent of 1926 parity levels. The weighted average of other raw materials on October 1, 1941, was approximately 90 percent of 1926 parity levels. Today the price of crude oil remains at approximately 59 percent of 1926 parity levels, while the price of other raw materials has advanced to approximately 112 percent of 1926 parity levels.

The front men for the "economy planners" have continued to turn a deaf ear

to the insistent pleas of the oil industry for a living price. They have refused to recognize that exploration cost per barrel of new reserves discovered has increased more than 6 times since 1938. They have refused to recognize the increase in the tax burden, the increase in wages, the increase in the cost of material and equipment, the shortage of manpower, and the added expense of regulation, regimentation, and governmental domineering. On the contrary, in typical bureaucratic fashion, they point to 47 units of the industry which, during the past year, were able to show a book profit on their operations. But the front men for the "planners" do not understand that these profits are the results of overproducing the reserves of these companies in order to supply the enormous military and civilian demands of our country and our allies. They do not understand that this continued overproduction of our reserves will result in waste of reservoir energy that will cause millions of barrels of oil to be left in the formation which can only be produced in the future by secondary methods at great expense. They do not understand that these companies, as a patriotic wartime duty are taking unwanted book profits at the expense of depleting their capital assets. The only thing that the front men for the "economy planners" understand and are concerned with is that a continued repression of prices will eventually bring about a shortage and scarcity of crude oil which they hope will reduce the industry to a few large units, which can be easily taken over or governmentally controlled, and will at the same time arouse public opinion in support of engaging this Nation in the oil business abroad.

The inadequacy of the existing price is admitted by the bureaucrats. The same letter that denied the industry a price adjustment offered a subsidy. The inconsistency of such bureaucratic thinking condemns its own arguments. It is, of course, apparent that there would be no necessity for a subsidy if the price were adequate.

It is true that the finding of new oil fields in this country is becoming increasingly difficult, and it is also true that our presently proven reserves represent only approximately 13 years' consumption based on current inflated war and lend-lease needs. To infer from these facts, however, that we are face to face with an oil famine unless the Government does something about it is unwarranted and misleading. In the first place, new fields will continue to be found, and if the industry is permitted a fair price for crude oil, they will be found at an increasing rate that will overcome the balance now in favor of consumption. Total discoveries of oil in the United States to date have amounted to approximately 45,000,000 barrels. Additional exploration and drilling to lower depths, in the opinion of many geologists of national reputation, give promise of disclosing probably an additional 45,000,000,000 barrels. At the present time we have in sight approximately 20,000,000,000 barrels of

proven recoverable reserves in the United States. This figure has been calculated on the basis of present production methods, but with the constantly improving technique of producing oil, this reserve may well be increased by five to ten billion barrels. For example, in the east Texas field the total recoverable reserve, originally estimated at 3,000,000,000 barrels, has now been increased to an expected 5,000,000,000 barrels by the experts on account of the production methods being employed in that field. The science of petroleum engineering is making steady and startling progress. In addition, proven methods of hydrogenation of our dry gas reserves may be counted on for an additional seventeen to twenty billion barrels of liquid petroleum.

As further security, our nationals have been active abroad. As a matter of fact, they have acquired ownership and control of oil reserves in foreign fields estimated by some as high as 20,000,000,000 barrels.

The bureaucrats make the argument that although we drilled some thirty-five hundred so-called wildcat wells last year, or about 100 more exploratory wells than during the previous year, there was a continued decline in the discovery of new reserves. On its face, these facts seem to indicate a growing shortage of crude oil in the United States. An analysis of these figures, however, will disclose that many of these wells were marginal in character and drilled in an effort to extend or define presently known fields, although classed as wildcats. Most of these wells were drilled by large corporate units of the industry which, by reason of the restraint placed on them by directors, investors, stockholders, and other restraining influences, moved with the caution and conservatism that is expected of men who are trustees of other people's money. Wildcat wells in the true sense are usually drilled by the independent operator, who is not responsible to anyone except himself for the money he spends and who has the spirit of the pioneer to venture his fortunes and efforts in the hazardous business of exploration. This is the reason that practically all of our great oil fields have been discovered by individuals and not by the large corporate units of the industry. The present price of crude oil makes this character of exploration impossible, and consequently there has been a constant decline in the discovery of new reserves under regulation and price control—an excellent example of what happens when "planned economy" is substituted for the basic law of supply and demand. The oil industry has been shamefully and unjustly punished and discriminated against simply because of the stubborn refusal of the bureaucrats in charge to learn and understand the facts. Although I disagree with the principle of fixing by legislation the price of an isolated commodity such as petroleum, and have announced that I cannot on principle support the pending bill to require the Office of Price Administration to increase the price of oil, I fully appreciate the responsibility of Congress to protect

and preserve the American oil industry and all other private enterprises, whose very existence is being threatened by the withering hand of bureaucracy. As I have suggested before, probably the most effective thing Congress can do is to abolish O. P. A. and recall the almost unlimited powers which have been granted to the Executive. I know there are some who sincerely believe that some sort of price control is a wartime necessity; but certainly the monstrosity that has been created under the Emergency Price Control Act cannot be justified.

The planned shortage and scarcity of oil has been backed up by a program of insidious propaganda. We have been told over and over that our domestic oil reserves are almost exhausted and that very little more will be found; therefore, it is necessary and expedient that we engage this Government in all phases of the oil business throughout the world. The President has suggested that there must be an international pooling of petroleum oil resources in order that all nations may have equal access to the petroleum produced in all parts of the world. Among those who appear to support such international socializing of petroleum, of course, is the president of Petroleum Reserves Corporation. In his American magazine article he said:

I am speaking objectively, not imperialistically * * * and with the fixed conviction that the petroleum of the world, as with all other great natural resources, belongs to the people of the world on some basis that will be equitable, considering all of the circumstances.

However, in the same article, Mr. Ickes says:

One of the greatest safeguards of the peace, to assure which we are at death grips with the enemy, would be for the peace-loving nations to face the future with oil enough, both for peace and for war, while the brutal and uncivilized nations would be permitted to have oil only for current needs.

The president of Petroleum Reserves Corporation is not too certain of what he means. In one breath he is socialistic, and in the next he is imperialistic. The one thing he is certain of is that the Government of the United States should directly engage in the oil business.

If our domestic oil industry had been permitted to operate freely and without the shackles which have been fastened upon it, it would have no doubt done what it has always done throughout its history—it would have found and produced all the oil required to meet all the demands. Instead, rationing grows more acute, and the civilian user faces the prospect that his present pitifully small allowance will again be reduced. The people are thus being conditioned to an acceptance of the policy of governmental controls which they are told will at some time, yet unspecified, produce greater amounts of gasoline and other petroleum products.

No better way of setting the stage could have been found than the one that was used. Under a frozen price and with rapidly advancing costs, the oil producers have been effectively stymied;

many have sold out and quit the business. This is a man-made shortage and the process is still continuing.

Scarcely a day passes that does not find someone proclaiming that we are approaching an oil famine; that we must turn to synthetic fuels under the direction, of course, of the Petroleum Administrator, or that our Government must rush into some other country and acquire in some manner a portion of another nation's oil, under the direction of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation. There is always the warning that we have reached the end of our oil-finding days at home. That note, of course, is not new. It has been sounded from the beginning of the industry. There has always been the pessimistic view that the latest oil field was about the last that would be found. The oil industry, of course, has had its lean years and its prosperous years, but its over-all history represents one of the greatest success stories of modern industrialism; however, this stalwart example of private enterprise cannot exist alongside of, and compete with, Government tax-free and tax-financed companies. Efficiency is of no avail when your competitor is not compelled to earn his way. It would be a short step from Government ownership in the foreign field to Government engagement in and domination of our domestic industry. Once the bars are down for the Government to enter the business of producing, distributing and marketing petroleum in competition with our own nationals, either at home or abroad, then the entire field of private enterprise becomes legitimate prey for bureaucracy.

I am convinced that the people of our Nation will demand a cessation of further encroachment of Government into business, and their representatives in Congress will respond with proper and effective legislation.

Mr. ROBERTSON obtained the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me so that I may make the point of no quorum?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I make the point of no quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Clark, Mo.	La Follette
Andrews	Connally	Langer
Austin	Danaher	Lodge
Bailey	Davis	Lucas
Ball	Downey	McCarran
Bankhead	Eastland	McClellan
Barkley	Ellender	McFarland
Bilbo	Ferguson	McKellar
Bone	George	Maloney
Brewster	Gerry	Maybank
Bridges	Gillette	Mead
Brooks	Green	Millikin
Buck	Guffey	Moore
Burton	Gurney	Murdock
Bushfield	Hatch	Murray
Butler	Hawkes	Nye
Byrd	Hayden	O'Daniel
Capper	Hill	O'Mahoney
Caraway	Holman	Overton
Chandler	Jackson	Pepper
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Clark, Idaho	Kilgore	Reed

Revercomb	Thomas, Okla.	Wahle, Mass.
Reynolds	Thomas, Utah	Walsh, N. J.
Robertson	Tobey	Wheeler
Russell	Truman	Wherry
Shipstead	Tunnell	White
Smith	Tydings	Wiley
Stewart	Vandenberg	Willis
Taft	Wagner	Wilson
Thomas, Idaho	Wallgren	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TRIBUTES TO RAYMOND CLAPPER

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, we have all just learned with the deepest horror and grief of the tragic death of Raymond Clapper in an airplane accident over the Marshall Islands. I am sure that I express not only the feeling of every Senator, but of all Mr. Clapper's friends and acquaintances, and of the public generally, when I say that we heard this sad news with profound sorrow.

Mr. Clapper rose from the humblest place in the newspaper world, by hard work and intelligent devotion to journalism, to one of the highest and most responsible positions. He not only was a great reporter, but he was an outstanding commentator, in the press and on the radio. His death is a great loss not only to his profession, but to the country which he served.

Mr. Clapper was not satisfied to write about this tragic war at long distance, but he put himself on the highway of danger, not only in Europe, but in the Pacific, where he met his untimely end. He died as a soldier in the cause of democracy.

Mr. President, I could not let this occasion pass without uttering these few words of deep regret and sorrow at the news we have heard, and expressing my appreciation of this great American.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it was never my privilege to know personally Mr. Clapper, but I did know of him as one who was a keen observer of the moving events in the life of America and of the world, and as an analyst of them. He rose round by round to the very top of his profession.

An English scholar wrote a series of essays about the men of the Revolution, and in his essay on Pitt he spoke of the glory of his ending. I think Mr. Clapper's ending was a glorious one. He was on the battle line, serving the public for which he had labored for many years analyzing events, and giving to the people of America and of the world his judgment of the causes and consequences of those events.

I join with the distinguished majority leader in expressions of sympathy to all those who were near and dear to Mr. Clapper.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I wish to add just a word to what has been said about Ray Clapper. For years he was a personal friend of Mrs. Ball and myself. I first knew him as a newspaperman, and I think it is true that all newspapermen regarded Ray Clapper as a newspaperman's newspaperman. He was always fair. Even when he became a nationally

known columnist, he went out and covered his beat, and got his news first-hand.

In Ray Clapper's death American journalism, accurate reporting, and fair commenting, have suffered a tragic loss.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to add an expression of deep regret over the death of Raymond Clapper. He was a Kansas product. He was a Kansas newspaperman, who came off the newspapers of Kansas to become perhaps the leading national columnist of his time. I wish to join in what the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Minnesota have said about Mr. Clapper, particularly as a newspaperman. Being a newspaperman myself, I can appreciate the full import of what the Senator from Minnesota has said; that of all the columnists, Raymond Clapper was the newspaperman's newspaperman.

Mr. HATCH subsequently said: Mr. President, when I arrived on the floor of the Senate today I was saddened by news which had come over the wires this morning and which has already been commented on by the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and other Senators, concerning a writer for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, Raymond Clapper. I shall not attempt at this time to deliver a eulogy of Mr. Clapper, but I do want to say that I also knew him personally, even as I have known Mr. Pyle, whose article in today's News I have had inserted in the RECORD.

I had a very high regard for Mr. Clapper. I also read his writings with interest and, I think, with information to myself. I have considered Mr. Clapper as a man not only of ability, Mr. President—many men have ability—but I considered him a man of honor and integrity, an essentially patriotic man, who when he died was engaged in carrying on the mission to which he had devoted his life and his career. He was a brave man, he was a courageous man, and as I have said, a man of honor and integrity.

I know of nothing more that I could say than these words which I have uttered in respect to his memory.

JAPANESE WAR RELOCATION CAMP

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in northwest Wyoming there is a Japanese war relocation camp. This camp is situated in Park County, of which the county seat is Cody. I have received a letter this morning from the sheriff of Park County which I feel should be made available to my colleagues in the Senate, and I am going to read it. But before doing so, as a background, I want Senators to know that many men from Park County, Wyo., were employed in the construction work on Wake Island prior to Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941. Very little has been heard from or of the majority of these men, and this condition naturally causes deep resentment against the occupants of this relocation camp.

Mr. President, with this background, I shall read the pertinent paragraphs of the letter I have received from the sheriff of Park County.

DEAR SENATOR: I was informed recently by Guy Robertson, Director of the Heart Moun-

tain relocation center, that the War Department is considering very seriously the removal of the soldiers, or military police as they are known, from the center. Originally there were approximately 150. This original company was moved about 3 months ago and a new detachment of about 60 soldiers sent in to replace them. Now they are considering taking these men away, leaving the camp with a Japanese police force to take care of the camp. This police force is composed of about 60 men at the present time and about two-thirds of these men are alien Japanese. If they withdraw the present military guard down there this camp will be without any protection from the outside.

Since the recent release of the Japanese atrocities to our American and Filipino soldiers the feeling against the Japanese is much stronger in this vicinity and might possibly result in a body of our local citizens moving in on the camp and a serious situation developing. The handling of this situation would temporarily fall on me, until military aid could be secured from Casper or Cheyenne.

Since the Government saw fit to establish the Japanese at the Heart Mountain relocation center against the wishes of the people of Wyoming, I feel that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to take care of them while they are here.

I advised Guy Robertson that I was opposed to the withdrawal of the military police, and I later called Governor Hunt on the phone advising him of this contemplated action. I might say that Governor Hunt feels as I do about it and is also opposed to the withdrawal of the police.

I feel that you, as a representative of the State of Wyoming in our National Congress, can do much to prevent this action and ask that you do everything you can to prevent this withdrawal of these military police.

We have had very little trouble with the Japanese at Heart Mountain and I feel that the principal reason for this is that the War Department has maintained an adequate military police force there.

Mr. President, it would be difficult for me to estimate the seriousness of what the sheriff of Park County writes. I am sending a copy of his letter with a protest to the Secretary of War, and also to the War Relocation Authority.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not think protection has ever been adequate at the Japanese relocation centers. For the most part the Army has undertaken to guard the outside areas of the camps with 150 or 160 military police, about two-thirds of them limited-service men. A failure to keep a strict military guard invites trouble. In some places they have already had trouble which was serious in some of its aspects.

Mr. President, I wish to join in the request of the Senator from Wyoming, and I sincerely hope the Army will not continue to risk danger by inadequately providing protection for the local areas where the camps are located. Withdrawal of guards invites trouble, and trouble may occur, and, if it does, it will be the responsibility of those who ought to see to it that adequate protection is afforded both for the public and for the

Japanese who are in the camps. The Army has not wanted to furnish the soldiers for protection. The War Relocation Authority has almost utterly failed to provide adequate protection, and time and again we have urged the Army to see to it that adequate protection is afforded to the people in the areas surrounding the camps. Such lack of protection I believe to be a tragic mistake. If continued it may cause a great deal of trouble. I certainly hope the Secretary of War will see the wisdom of the position stated by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his assistance.

SIMPLIFICATION OF INCOME-TAX LAWS AND RETURNS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a Senate resolution calling upon the Finance Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to make a full and complete study of the present Federal tax laws with a view to ascertaining the extent to which such laws, or administration thereof, can be simplified, and I am asking that the report of that committee be made to the Senate at the earliest practical date.

The people of this country are not only aroused about the most extensive and expensive bureaucracy in world history, which has placed under its microscope the investigation and regulation of almost every phase of our lives, but right now, because they are making out their tax returns, they are concerned with the complexities involved in the income-tax law and returns. They are not only put to an expense in making out these returns but because of their complex nature are confused. I know whereof I speak. I have just returned from the Middle West.

The resolution I am submitting might be considered by many as unnecessary, as it is the function of the Finance Committee, together with the Treasury Department, to whip into shape a tax bill that will be less harassing.

We have had assurances for some time that this matter will be given study. I have spoken on this subject before, but, Mr. President, this resolution is a direction that a special group—preferably a special subcommittee of the Finance Committee—be given this problem and that they go to work on it. It is not for me to say at this time how the income-tax laws could be drastically simplified. I have several suggestions which I will submit to such committee in due time. I feel, however, that if the committee should be constituted and should proceed to act it would receive from persons who are not tax experts, if you please, and who have not become befogged in tax returns, many suggestions which might contribute toward the solution of this troublesome problem. There are individuals outside Congress and outside government who might make some very valuable suggestions in connection with this thought of simplification.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be referred to the appropriate committee,

and that a copy thereof be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 250) was received and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study of the present Federal tax laws with a view to ascertaining the extent to which such laws and the administration thereof can be simplified. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study, together with its recommendations concerning methods of effectuating such simplification.

For the purpose of this study, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$—, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, with great respect for the resolution which has just been submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin, and with complete sympathy for the objective at which he aims, I want to say for the Senate Finance Committee—and I am sure I shall be sustained by the able chairman—that there is no lack of understanding in the Senate Finance Committee that tax forms today are insufferably complicated. I doubt whether we require any directives in order to appreciate the fact that the next job is to simplify tax returns.

I think it ought to be understood and appreciated that the task of simplification is not quite so easy as it sounds. The complication in tax forms and in tax laws is not due to any lack of effort to establish simplified and uniform tax formulae. It is the result of the fact that 90 percent of every tax law consists of relief provisions which become apparent after a tax has been levied because of the wide complexity of conditions in a country the size of the United States.

It is a very simple matter to agree with the general principle that there ought to be simplification, just as it is a very simple matter to agree that it would be a wonderful thing if we could raise \$20,000,000,000 in new taxes instead of \$10,000,000,000. That is a very easy thing to say. It is a very difficult thing to do. It is a very simple thing upon which to generalize. It is a very difficult thing upon which to particularize. As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, deeply sympathizing with the desire for the maximum revenue available in this country, I would express the hope that our consultants up and down the country, when they are giving us advice, would undertake, so far as possible, to

be specific and tell us where we can get the money which is needed, for, otherwise, the advice is not of great value. I am referring at this point to the question of how much money can be raised.

Now I return to the question of simplification. I completely sympathize with the objectives to which the able Senator from Wisconsin addresses himself, but I want to make it quite plain that the problem has long been recognized and that the Senate Finance Committee intends, if it be humanly possible, to do precisely the thing which the Senator requests.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Have any steps been taken toward simplifying the form of the tax returns?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; and in the law which is now pending there will be some simplification as a result of the work upon the tax bill now awaiting final approval in conference.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Can we hold out any hope to the people of the country who are required to fill out these very involved tax returns that there will be a form which will be much simpler than the one they now have to fill out?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think there is very definite reason for hope in that direction, if on no other basis than the adages that the nearer a disease approaches a crisis the nearer it approaches a cure, and that it is always darkest before the dawn. I think we have reached the point where we must simplify. There is no alternative.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I agree with the Senator that it has not only reached a crisis, but an epidemic. The complaints are epidemic, and justify a sweeping change.

Is the able Senator able to tell us whether there may be simplification in the very near future or at any time which the Senator may be able to specify?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator means whether any substantial simplification will be possible before the March 15 returns are filed, I shall say "No"; but there is every disposition to work for simplification.

Mr. REVERCOMB. May we assure those who write us on this subject that it is being dealt with by the Finance Committee of the Senate and that there is reason to believe that the form will be simplified within a reasonable time in the future?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I certainly hope so. The Senator will understand that the form can only be simplified as the tax structure itself is simplified, because the form has to reflect the structure and the system. Certainly, there is every disposition on the part of the Senate Finance Committee to simplify the structure so that the form itself may be simplified, because it is certain that we have reached a point where the willing taxpayer needs a civil engineer and a Philadelphia lawyer and a crystal gazer in order to find out what he owes. We have reached a situation which is intolerable.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I wish it to be clearly understood that in submitting the resolution and in the remarks I have made, I have not intended to reflect on the Finance Committee. But, Mr. President, I make the specific point that everybody's business is nobody's business. I suggest that the Finance Committee appoint a special subcommittee of its own members, having the specific obligation not to study the tax bill now pending, but between now and the time when the next tax bill is considered, to study this problem and to get the benefit of ideas of men outside the committee as well as of men in the committee, but having the specific problem in front of it, and nothing else. When that is done, we shall obtain a simplification in law and forms. Until that is done, we shall get only a more complicated bill. That is human nature. We have seen it occur all too often when everybody's business is nobody's business.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to say that I completely disagree with him in his last observation.

Mr. WILEY. It is not the first time we have completely disagreed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No. I agree that what is everybody's business is nobody's business; but I doubt whether any subdivision of the Senate Finance Committee could be more completely impressed than is the whole committee with the necessity for simplification and with the desire to proceed in this direction as rapidly as possible.

I repeat that it is impossible to simplify the tax form until the system is simplified; and our problem is to simplify the system. We have just sat through 2 or 3 months' consideration of the latest tax bill, which is a relatively minor bill as tax bills go. The committee has sat hour after hour, day after day, week after week, listening—to what? To citizens of the United States seeking relief from the application of some general tax which would be very simple indeed if it could be applied wholesale. The trouble is that this is a very great country, with very great complexities in its tax problems and in connection with the impact of taxes. This matter is not one of simply sitting down to the problem of simplifying a return. The problem is to simplify the system itself. We should start at the bottom and should rewrite the entire tax structure of the United States; and, in my opinion, until we do so, the simplification will not be what it should be and what the people of the country are entitled to have.

Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. WILEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield first to the Senator from Texas, and then shall yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Michigan that I am very happy indeed that the Senator from Wisconsin submitted the resolution. I assume he has a plan which he would be glad to submit to the Finance Committee, with a detailed outline of how tax forms and returns could be simplified. As a member of the Fi-

nance Committee, I am sure I am in agreement with the Senator from Michigan in stating that we welcome any simplification. It is very easy merely to declare by statute that the form shall be simplified; but simplifying it is another matter. It is impossible to simplify something which is not simple. American business is not simple; it is complex. Whenever we frame a tax law providing for a certain kind of tax, by the time we meet again a great many smart people have devised ways of evading the tax or avoiding it or detouring around it, and then we have to fill up the gaps.

Whenever we fill up the gaps we make the return more complicated and more complex. The only way we can really simplify it is to do away with all but one tax, and to say that everyone shall pay that tax. That would be simple. But whenever we introduce two taxes we have to adjust the form of the returns in order to show accurately the liability of the taxpayers with reference to those two taxes; and whenever we introduce three kinds of taxes, we have to add something else, and so on, ad infinitum. That is particularly true now, when there is such a tremendous urge to get all the possible revenue we can obtain from every source.

I am not apologizing for the Finance Committee. I am a very humble member of the committee. I have been on it ever since I have been in the Senate. If anyone thinks it is a picnic to serve on the Finance Committee, he should come there and sit with us for a couple of days. The committee perspires and sweats and toils and labors. That happens every time we have a meeting. The committee is one of the most toilsome, hard-working, hard-riding committees we have in the Senate. We would like to make the returns simple. If we could simplify the returns, we would simplify our duties and our tasks; and I commend the Senator from Wisconsin when he says he is going to help us on this matter. I welcome his help. I should be glad, as a humble member of the committee, to submit his new form.

But I wish to suggest to the Senator that the Treasury has been wrestling with the tax forms ever since 1913, when the first income-tax law was enacted. The Treasury Department is interested in making the form simple, because the simpler it is the less labor it will have in analyzing the returns and obtaining the results. The Finance Committee wants to see the tax form simplified, but we cannot by a resolution simplify something which is not in itself simple. Business, enterprise, and initiative in America are not simple. They are complex, and in dealing with a complex subject we must have a complex return to find out just what the attitude of the taxpayer is.

I wish to thank the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I welcome his help.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE rose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I will yield to the senior Senator from Wisconsin in a moment.

Nothing which I have said reflects in any way upon the purpose of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] in

raising this issue. It simply occurred to me that there has been a great deal of criticism which is based upon misinformation. Let me repeat that the criticism applies not only to the tax form but also to the total taxation available these days. I should be particularly interested in hearing from those who think we can raise \$10,000,000,000, \$13,000,000,000, or \$20,000,000,000. I should be greatly interested in knowing where, when, and how it can be done, because we have struggled to raise two and a half billion dollars. There is not a nickel of it with respect to which there was not a battery of witnesses attending the meetings of our committee to tell us that we were going to wreck everything by raising two and a half billion dollars.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield first to the senior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I merely wish to make this comment for the Record: I believe that every member of the Finance Committee, as well as every Member of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, desires to see the tax structure simplified. I firmly believe that it must be simplified if in the end it is not to break down altogether. However, I wish to point out the fact that many of the complexities of the existing structure are due to the efforts of the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives to mitigate the impact of taxes upon certain situations. Many of the complexities grow out of our efforts to provide cushions for the individual as well as the corporate taxpayer. Those who think that it is easy to simplify the tax structure must bear in mind that the effect of oversimplification would be to impose in a harsh and ruthless manner, upon both individuals and corporations, the taxes which are now levied.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I entirely agree with the Senator's comment.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to know whether the Senator, as the ranking Republican member of the Finance Committee, has received any specifications from the representatives of the new school of thought, advocating a \$20,000,000,000 increase in taxes, which would guide the committee in accomplishing that result?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No. At the moment my information is confined to the wishful thinking concerning which I have read in the newspapers.

Mr. TAFT. I have this to suggest with respect to complications: To a large extent they are due to lack of cooperation between the Treasury and the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Ways and Means Committee of the House. Every tax bill with which I have had anything to do has been a perpetual struggle, first between the Ways and Means Committee and the Treasury, and then between the Treasury and the Finance Committee of the Senate. Such struggles usually end in compromises; and every time we make a compromise we have a new complication. I suggest that if the Treasury representa-

tives would only sit down in advance with the Ways and Means Committee of the House or the Finance Committee of the Senate, or both, and talk things over, we might make some compromises in advance, so that before we started we could agree on the principles on which the tax bill was to be written. Then it would be fairly simple to go about the business of carrying out those principles in the simplest possible way, instead of the most complicated way.

The Senator will recall that last fall he and I were summoned by the Secretary of the Treasury to his office. He told us about the plan which he intended to submit to the Congress 2 or 3 days later, for raising ten and a half billion dollars. Incidentally, it was only a six-and-a-half billion dollar plan, because \$4,000,000,000 represented compulsory savings, and would have to be paid in bonds.

He did not ask our advice in any respect. I supposed, of course, that we were invited there so that we might express our opinions in advance in order that a plan might be worked out in Congress. He did not ask the opinion of any Senator or any Member of the House. I ventured the suggestion that the plan looked wrong to me; that apparently there was a reduction in taxes for millions of taxpayers. I did not think they were asking for a reduction.

Nothing further was said, and we left. Two days later that plan was submitted exactly as it was read to us, and 2 days later it was thrown out by the Ways and Means Committee. From that day to this, the Treasury has never moved 1 inch from that plan. There has been a perpetual fight going on all the time, resulting, as I say, in compromises, which nearly always add complications to a tax bill.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

I wish to make this further reply to the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], who was hunting for some tangible consolation—

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like very much to have it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the situation in which the poor befuddled taxpayer finds himself—to the number of 50,000,000 at the present moment.

Let me repeat that simplification of the form must follow simplification of the system itself. The form is just as simple today as the tax system itself will permit. Under the Constitution, any change in the system must originate in the House of Representatives, because it is a revenue matter.

The most tangible reply I can make the able Senator from West Virginia is that within the past 10 days Representative CARLSON of Kansas has submitted to the House a very important and very practical proposal, which invites a very substantial simplification of the system itself, through the combination of various types of taxes into one tax applied to one base. I know of no reason why what I may call the Carlson formula should not be developed in the reasonably near future. Certainly that is my hope. No one could be more aware of the problem

of complex tax returns than are members of the Senate Finance Committee. It is a problem. As the junior Senator from Wisconsin has indicated, it goes to the very heart of popular morale in respect to the relationship between Government and its citizens. The present return is utterly insufferable, but the reason is the law itself.

No one could be more eager than am I to correct this situation and to arrive at a concentrated tax formula which could be reflected in a concentrated and simplified return. I can assure the Senator from Wisconsin that not only have I been giving hours, days, and weeks to this problem in the past, but this morning I had a conference with three experts on the subject. I am sure that I and every other member of the Senate Finance Committee in dealing with this problem will continue to search for the objective to which the Senator very appropriately lends his emphasis.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am quite sure that every Member of this body knows how correct the Senator from Michigan is when he says that he is earnestly working toward the end which we all seek in the simplification of the tax system and the resulting tax form. It is very encouraging to hear the statement made that, as a matter of fact, steps are being taken, and that a plan has been submitted to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, which first deals with the tax problem, which plan, if followed, may lay the foundation for a more simplified tax form.

I appreciate the statement made by the Senator from Michigan. I appreciate the work which he and the other members of the Finance Committee have done. But if there is one thing which is needed today for the morale—to use the words of the Senator from Michigan—of the people of the country who are taxpayers, it is a simplified tax system, and certainly a simplified tax return.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I agree completely with the Senator. I apologize for leading off in this discussion today. The able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the Finance Committee, is on the floor, and he is much more able to discuss the subject than I. He himself has given deep study to and expended much effort on the problem of simplification. I see that he is on his feet, and if the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] will forgive me, I should like to yield to the Senator from Georgia for any comment which he may wish to make.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement.

More than a year ago, after we had finished the 1942 tax bill, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation I specifically instructed the staff to devote itself to the study of the simplification of our tax laws. The forms are made up in the office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue with Treasury approval. Of course, they have to conform to the law as it is written. For many months the Joint Committee on Internal

Revenue Taxation has been giving study to such a simplification of our tax system as would lead to a simplified tax-return law.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a moment?

Mr. GEORGE. Allow me to proceed for one moment, please, and then I shall yield.

The staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation was empowered to bring into its service from the outside a committee composed of men who are familiar with and are students of our taxing system. That has been done. The committee has been at work. Three or four able men have contributed their services without cost to the Government. The committee has also cooperated with the Treasury, and for the last several months the Treasury has been giving study to the problem of tax simplification. I make that statement preliminary to what I am about to say.

Since 1940 we have been engaged in increasing taxes and, therefore, greatly increasing the rates. It is easy enough to simplify a tax return. It can be done, let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin, by simply providing that, without regard to family status, without regard to whether there are children or how many, a flat tax shall be imposed on the total income of everyone. Suppose the Senate Finance Committee reported that kind of a bill to the Senate; how long would it last? Yet, that is the basis of simplification—no exemptions, no exceptions; a flat tax on income generally. The Senator and I know there is not a Member of this Senate who would vote for such a bill. Yet, that is the way to simplify the tax return.

Our tax laws have become complicated because as we have increased the tax rates it has been absolutely necessary to safeguard against hardship cases and inequities which would be imposed by any straight-line tax system with the rates as high as they now are. That is why we have complications in our system, and there will always be complications in the system so long as the rates remain at their present level.

I read in this morning's newspaper that Mr. Willkie has suggested there should be sixteen or twenty more billions of dollars raised as taxes. I wonder how much thought he has given to the subject. I wonder how he would obtain the money. I wonder where he would impose the tax.

Last year the Congress made a desperate effort to put the taxpayers on a pay-as-you-earn basis. In order to do so we had to compromise by carrying over one-fourth of 1 year's taxes. That meant complications. Yet, that was the only way by which we could bring about a reform which was sorely needed.

Now what is the situation? If the present pay-as-you-earn tax program is retained with its present 20 percent withholding at the source—and by no other device can the program be maintained—and we should attempt to raise ten and a half billion dollars more, as the Treasury recommended, it would be necessary to withhold in the low brackets 32 percent. Would Senators

vote for that kind of a bill? I do not think they would.

If we were to adopt Mr. Willkie's theory we would have to withhold about 40 percent in the lowest income bracket. Do Senators believe we could take 40 percent of the dollar of every worker in America who is subject to a tax? I do not think it could be done without destroying the morale of the American people.

I have repeatedly said that if we are to obtain a substantial increase in revenue from taxation we must consider new methods of taxes, and new sources of revenue. We have not been able to do that because it has met with opposition on the part of the Treasury. So there we are. We have spent the greater part of the last 3 or 4 years in fighting over rates and methods of taxation, and had very little time to give our thought and attention to the simplification of the tax laws. We have made some progress in simplification. We have made it in the bill which is still in conference.

For instance, we have taken away from the individual income taxpayer all credit for earned income. That simplifies the tax return. There is no doubt about that. But it also increases the burden on the individual income taxpayer.

We have done another thing which simplifies the tax law. We have provided that the income taxpayer may not deduct from his gross income for income-tax purposes money paid by way of Federal excise taxes, such as taxes on theater tickets, gasoline taxes, or whatever other kind of tax he has been accustomed to pay on articles on which the Federal Government has levied an excise tax. We have taken those two steps towards simplification in the bill which is yet in conference. The simplifications are at the cost of the individual income taxpayer. There is no doubt about that. We could simplify the tax law by taking away all exemptions. We could take away the \$1,200 exemption for a married person, and then it would not be necessary for him to calculate his exemptions. We could simplify it further by taking away the taxpayer's \$500 exemption, if he is a single person, and he would not have to calculate it. We could also simplify it by taking away the \$350 exemption for each child or other person dependent on the taxpayer. It is possible to bring about a great many simplifications, but they would be brought about at the cost of the taxpayers unless we changed our whole tax system.

I said just now that the tax returns and forms are made up in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, with Treasury approval. Necessarily, Mr. President, those forms are designed to see whether you and I are telling the truth when we make our tax returns. If it were left to the individual to make out his tax return it could be made very simple even under a complicated tax law, but the Treasury wants to know whether the taxpayer has arrived at the right conclusion.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The able Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the

Finance Committee, has again made a statement about which I want to make an inquiry for information. Are the complicated forms about which we have heard so much complaint from taxpayers throughout the country printed in the Bureau of Internal Revenue?

Mr. GEORGE. They are made up through the joint activity of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Treasury Department, or a committee that is charged with that responsibility.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Do they make up the form that is used today?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; it is made up in that way.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the Finance Committee of the Senate or the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives consulted by the Treasury Department or by the Bureau of Internal Revenue as to what shall go into the form.

Mr. GEORGE. No; except as we may bring up questions that relate to the form and as we have written a short form for taxpayers whose taxable income does not exceed \$3,000 derived from certain sources such as wages, salaries, annuities, interest, and so forth. All taxpayers may use the short form if their income does not exceed \$3,000.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does not the Senator feel that the form might be simplified by consultation with, or, I might say, by direction of the Finance Committee of the Senate or the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives or the two together.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know how we could do that so long as we have administrative officers whose duty it is to devise the form and have it printed and sent to all taxpayers. We could, of course, write into the law itself a form which all taxpayers should be required to file, but I do not think that would be a practical approach to the question, because, necessarily, the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Treasury Department must prepare the form in order to develop the tax liability of the individual or the corporation making the return, and that forces them to go right back to the law itself. If there is to be any great simplification or tax reform, it must be through the simplification of the tax system itself.

I agree fully with what the Senator from Michigan and other Senators have said on that point; but I do not appreciate the fact that a great many Members of this body as well as a great many columnists are constantly talking about the complexities of our tax form. Of course they are complex, but consider the point to which the rates have gone, consider now what the tax burden is, and realize, if you can, that if hardship cases are not guarded against a great many taxpayers will be crucified. We must of necessity not do that. I would rather have some complexity, so far as I am concerned, than to crucify helpless taxpayers by any sort of a straight-line tax system or tax form that would make it easy for some men to pay their taxes but make it impossible for many other millions of Americans to pay their taxes.

Mr. President, I have referred to two

steps. I could call attention to the fact that we have taken at least three or four steps in the bill which is now in conference to simplify the tax form itself, because, if we eliminate from the law certain exemptions and certain deductions, then there is no need for the form to call for a calculation of those exemptions and those deductions. It is impossible for those steps in simplification to manifest themselves in the March 15 return, because the bill which we have passed deals with the taxes from December 31, 1943, on, and is not retroactive. Tax liability for 1943 has already accrued; it has already risen under existing law.

There is another point to which I should like to call attention. The Senate Finance Committee and the Senate itself have no original jurisdiction in matters of taxation. Any law that affects the revenue, even by way of simplification of the system, whether it increases the revenue or decreases it, must originate in the House of Representatives. I am not saying that by way of shirking responsibility for a study of the complex character of our tax laws at this time, or for the purpose of relieving the Finance Committee from the necessity of studying it; but I want to repeat that after we completed work upon the last tax bill an agreement was reached by which the Treasury and the joint committee staff would immediately begin a study of the question of simplifying our tax laws and tax forms and tax returns. On the committee which I instructed the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to set up there are representatives outside the Government, men who have given great and long study to this problem, and they have been working on it for several months. We have a definite assurance, as I stated several times in the discussion of the tax bill before this body, that the Ways and Means Committee immediately after the tax bill is out of the way would begin a study looking to a simplification of the tax system, which is of course the first step toward any material or substantial simplification of forms and returns.

That is the situation. I know that the tax returns are complicated, that they are disturbing. I know also that it is impossible to devise any return that will make the taxpayer disclose what his liability is on the face of his return without having complications which people who have not had any experience in making returns will find very difficult and troublesome.

Now, Mr. President, let me say further that I appreciate the willingness of every Member of this body to assist the Finance Committee, and I shall be glad to give the opportunity to every Senator to appear before the Finance Committee. Finally the responsibility rests upon every Member of this body, regardless of whether he is a member of the Finance Committee or not, so far as the simplification of the tax laws and even of the forms is concerned; but the first responsibility is on the committee, and the committee has been trying to discharge its responsibility in that regard. When we reach the time when a reduction of tax rates in this country can occur, if we

reach that time, then we can make some simplification of our tax structure.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I wish to address a question to the chairman of the Finance Committee with reference to his remarks. Referring to the comments of many critics in the country about the low amount of yield of the new tax bill, I ask the Senator whether I am correct in my understanding that the tax bill just adopted by the conferees, superimposed upon the existing tax structures, will require individual taxpayers of this country to pay \$17,000,000,000, and that the total tax income from industry and from individuals will be about \$44,000,000,000? Is that approximately correct?

Mr. GEORGE. It is approximately correct. The total individual income-tax burden, under the bill just adopted, will be more than \$17,000,000,000, say \$17,000,000,000 in round numbers. Nearly the same amount will be collected from corporations. There will be, in addition, about a billion dollars plus, in the form of increased excise taxes.

The total receipts of Government, the national income, assuming the present level of business, will, under the bill which is now in conference, be brought to above \$43,000,000,000, and in addition there will be the income under the provisions of the bill which require the return of every dollar of money recovered through renegotiation, or through the reduction in contracts, which we have been told has been running at the rate of approximately \$5,000,000,000 for the year 1942, and is now to be paid into the Treasury. So that when we figure the taxes, plus the renegotiation provisions, we find that the total tax burden on the American people will be not far from \$48,000,000,000, and there is to be added another eleven billion collected by the States, counties, and municipalities from the same taxpayers.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator. I regret very much that the sources of public information, notably, the columnists and commentators and newspaper writers, so often do not bring that truth, so salient and so impressive, to the attention of the people, while they do voice the direct criticism that the Congress has been derelict in its duty. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, because apparently I stirred up this hornet's nest today. I should like to ask him whether there is anything particularly wrong about the language of the resolution proposed, which provides as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study of the present Federal tax laws with a view to ascertaining the extent to which such laws and the administration thereof can be simplified. The committee shall report to the Senate at the

earliest practicable date the results of such study, together with its recommendations concerning methods of effectuating such simplification.

It was not my intention to offend anyone. In fact, I had no idea there were so many sensitive folks in the Senate. I did not realize that when I rose to present a resolution virtually along the line of the demand of 99 percent of our people, anyone would feel I was particularly sticking a pin into him, yet we have here seen member after member of the Finance Committee rise and speak as if the resolution was a direct attack on him. The "skittish mustang" from Texas [Senator CONNALLY] particularly was put out.

I wish to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Finance. He has the regard and affection of every Member of the Senate; indeed, I do not believe there is a man in the Nation who stands higher than does he. At the same time, as he has conceded on the floor of the Senate, for a year or more past we have been talking simplification, but we have complication.

All I ask is that a special subcommittee of the Committee on Finance, headed, for example, by someone such as the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] would make it its business to look into the matter, and if we cannot simplify, say so to the people, after full hearings and the process suggested by the Senator from West Virginia and other Senators has been followed.

There was no intention on my part of casting any aspersions upon any Senator, or to criticize anyone for not performing his duty. Nevertheless every Senator who has spoken has admitted the need of tax simplification, because of the harassment to which the people are subjected in making out their returns. I feel there is a way out. I feel the Finance Committee can find that way. But that way will not be found by taking the defeatist attitude, manifested by some of the remarks made here today.

Nothing is impossible for the American when he goes to work. Let us go to work and meet the demands of our people to simplify the tax laws and tax returns.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator from Wisconsin, I had an idea that he had some such purpose as that. I do not know whether the Senator had knowledge of the fact that the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, with a group of men gathered from all quarters of this country, together with certain Treasury officials, have been at work on this very problem, and will be ready to start hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means as soon as the present tax bill is out of the way. I understand the Senator's motive and purpose, and I am sure there is nothing personal in it, and that it is not aimed at anyone, but is merely aimed at the correction of a situation which is onerous and burdensome and disturbing to our taxpayers.

Mr. WILEY. Is it the Senator's understanding that the committee of which he has spoken will in the near future

file a report indicating their suggestions as to the simplification of the law itself, and of the forms?

Mr. GEORGE. Both, primarily the law, because after all the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Treasury must make up the forms to elicit information which will enable them to administer the law as Congress writes it. They are ready to begin public hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means as soon as that committee is able to take up the question, and the chairman of the committee has given assurance that he did not wish to wait even until March 15, but wished to wait only for a breathing space of 10 days, or some such time, after the present bill is out of the way.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if I may ask a question, is the resolution aimed at simplifying the tax returns?

Mr. WILEY. My resolution contemplates that a subcommittee of the Committee on Finance shall be appointed by the chairman of that committee to study the subject of simplifying the tax law and tax returns.

Mr. SMITH. My reason for asking the question is that I have received letters from all over the country, and many from my State, from prominent men, and from some who are not so prominent, protesting that they cannot fill out intelligently the present income-tax return forms. I wish to join in asking that they be simplified.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1612) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I have brought with me to the floor of the Senate for the purpose of asking that it be printed in the Record an article by Mr. Ernie Pyle, a writer for the Scripps-Howard newspapers. The article deals with the subject under discussion, the soldiers' vote.

Mr. President, I have very high regard for Mr. Pyle. It may derive from the fact that he is a prominent resident of my State; that is, whenever he is home he lives in New Mexico. I read his articles daily with interest, and I gather a great deal of information from them. So I have brought this article to the floor with me today, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SOLDIERS WANT TO VOTE

(By Ernie Pyle)

IN ITALY, February 3.—The British Army recently announced a new system of wound and foreign-service stripes, similar to ours of the last war. I've wondered for a long time when we would get around to doing it ourselves; and if you ask me, the sooner the better.

The new British wound insignia is to be a straight up-and-down gold stripe an inch and a half long on the left forearm. There will be one for each wound. Similar stripes of

red will be granted for each year of service in the war.

Ours of the last war was a golden "V" on the right sleeve for each wound, and the same on the left sleeve for each 6 months of service abroad.

A little thing like a stripe can do wonders for morale. And certainly it's pointless to wait till everybody gets home, for the average soldier will get into civvies the moment he gets his discharge. Over here, and right now, is when wound and service stripes would give a guy a chance to get a little kick out of wearing his record on his sleeve.

In fact, I wouldn't mind parading a few stripes myself. Very shortly I'll have a total of 2 years overseas since World War No. 2 began and since I'm now at the age where hardening of the arteries may whisk me off at any moment, I'd like somebody to see my stripes before it's too late.

A thing I've always feared in war zones has at last happened—my typewriter has broken down.

A certain metal bracket has crashed right in two, and you can no longer turn the cylinder and make a new line by hitting the little lever on the side.

Still, all in all, the break-down could be much worse, and I don't know that a broken typewriter makes so much difference, anyhow, to a correspondent who is unable to think of anything better than his broken typewriter to write about.

A few weeks ago I mentioned that the boys in a certain artillery battery were betting on whether Schlitz beer ever came in green bottles or not.

Well, R. Ray Parsons, of Indianapolis, writes that the Schlitz bottle was brown for many years, but that because of the wartime bottle shortage it is now often put in green bottles. That settles the argument, but the best part is yet to come.

Mr. Parsons was a private in the A. E. F. in the last war and he is a Schlitz salesman. He has now been so carried away with his own war memories, and his enthusiasm for the ripe quality of his own suds, that he offers to buy the two artillerymen all the beer they can drink in a week after they get back to America. If they'll write him, he'll make the date.

That would be fine but, Mr. Parsons, what the artillerymen and everybody else want is beer over here right now. Everybody but me, of course.

All America seems to be worrying about whether the soldiers are going to get to vote.

Well, if you'll let me have the platform a moment, I think I can tell you how it is. I can't answer for the Army which is either in training or in behind-the-lines routine jobs, but I think I can answer for the front-line combat soldier, and the answer is this:

Surely, he wants to vote. If you ask him he'll say yes. But he actually thinks little about it, and if there's going to be any red tape about it he'll say, "Nuts to it."

The average combat soldier is so consumed with the job of merely keeping alive, and with contributing what bare little he can to his own miserable existence, that he has little room in him for thinking about the ballot. If you offered him his choice between voting in November and finding a dirty cowshed to lie down in out of the rain tonight, the cowshed would win.

If the Army could set up the machinery and some day all of a sudden tell every soldier in the combat zone to step up and mark his "X" if he wanted to, then 99 percent of the front-line troops would vote.

But if soldiers have to fill out long questionnaires from their home States, sign affidavits, and fuss around with reading and writing out complicated lists, then I think 99 percent of those same front-line troops would say:

"To hell with it, we'd rather have a cigar ration at suppertime instead."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, yesterday I inserted in the *RECORD* telegrams from 46 Governors. The 2 Governors who had not then replied were the Governor of Arkansas and the Governor of Louisiana, with respect to what their States had done concerning amendment of the existing laws to permit the soldiers to vote. The Governor of Arkansas has telegraphed me as follows:

No change in statute required to permit soldiers to vote. Following World War No. 1 our legislature passed laws making possible voting of soldiers and sailors in armed services. Soldiers on foreign soil will be able to vote in preferential primary and general election. Soldiers within confines of the United States can vote in both preferential as well as run-off and general election. Necessary changes being effected by revision of rules of the Democratic State Central Committee in cooperation with county judges throughout the State who are purchasing poll taxes for absentee servicemen.

HOMER M. ADKINS,
Governor of Arkansas.

The Governor of Louisiana telegraphed me as follows:

Louisiana Legislature in 1942 passed voting law protecting rights of all registered soldiers and servicemen and same is being used widely in current gubernatorial campaign.

SAM H. JONES,
Governor of Louisiana.

Mr. President, the Governor of Minnesota has sent me a second telegram, as follows:

Minnesota has not amended its laws to permit foreign voting but we plan to do so by calling a special session of the State legislature for that purpose.

EDWARD J. THYE,
Governor.

Mr. President, the telegrams indicate that at least 43 States have already made the necessary changes in their laws, or given notice, through their Governors, of their intention to do so.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that there be inserted, as a part of the remarks I am about to make on the pending amendment, an editorial entitled "Soldier Vote Message," published in the *Columbus Evening Dispatch* of January 28.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

SOLDIER VOTE MESSAGE—A DEMAGOGIC CAMPAIGN APPEAL

The Congress, which has once rejected the Green-Lucas bill that would give the Roosevelt administration virtual control over the votes of the men and women in the armed services should reject it again.

It should be rejected because Mr. Roosevelt's message is first of all a brazenly demagogic campaign document based on the false premise that an attempt is being made by Congress—specifically the Republicans and anti-New Dealers—to keep members of the armed forces from voting, when there is actually no intent on the part of anyone in this direction. It is designed to arouse the indignation of service people and insure their support for the fourth-term ticket.

It should be rejected because it would cancel out still another constitutionally established right of the individual States—that of conducting their own elections.

It should be rejected because Mr. Roosevelt in the part of the message in which he calls himself merely "an interested citizen" once again has attempted to exceed his authority

and crack the whip over Congress by demanding a roll-call vote on the measure in question.

It should be rejected because, in the part of the message in which the President again assumes the role of Commander in Chief he attempts to identify himself with the armed forces and to speak for them despite the fact that his own military background includes nothing more than swivel-chair service as an Under Secretary of the Navy, and the purely perfunctory title of Commander in Chief of the armed forces which is vested as an ex officio formality in the Presidency, not the individual President.

If Mr. President wishes to do something on behalf of service men and women, he would do better to relax the regulations which, he charges, are such that they are "not ordinarily permitted to write their Congressmen on pending legislation." This certainly must be within his wide wartime powers. Moreover, it seems more democratic to let the soldiers speak for themselves, a privilege which they would undoubtedly appreciate, besides making it unnecessary for Mr. Roosevelt to burden himself with that additional duty.

It should be rejected because Mr. Roosevelt voices an unfair blanket indictment of all the 48 States, including Ohio and the others which are moving swiftly or already have acted to insure a vote next November for their citizens in uniform. He lumps the innocent and guilty together under the same all-inclusive condemnation.

If he wishes to make a recommendation on the mechanics of soldier voting which will be fair and constitutional, let Mr. Roosevelt single out the recreant States by name and call on them to do their duty instead of talking in sweeping terms about "fraud" and "sacred rights," and other inflammatory terms more suited to the campaign stump than to a statesman's message. Everyone knows which are the recalcitrant States and what their motives are—and also that they are without exception those which have been among the strongest supporters of the administration.

It should be rejected because of the feeble administration argument that to send ballots from individual States overseas would overload shipping facilities—this is in the face of the multiplied tons of O. W. I. propaganda that have been and are being handled, even including Roosevelt buttons for the inhabitants of north Africa and Italy.

Finally, it should be rejected, because Mr. Roosevelt's accusations and recommendations add up simply to this—that the administration politicians wish to take the machinery of the soldier vote into their own hands. And in 12 years of New Deal rule the public has had ample opportunity to see what happens to the people's interests when the Federal bureaucracy gets control of anything.

Mr. TAFT. I also ask that there be inserted as a part of my remarks two articles, one by Mr. Frank R. Kent, which appeared in the *Cincinnati Enquirer* recently, dealing with the subject of the soldier vote; the other by Mr. George E. Sokolsky under the heading "Votes for Soldiers."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

PRESIDENT EXPECTS GREAT BOOST FOR FOURTH TERM CANDIDACY FROM SOLDIERS, KENT SAYS—VIGOROUS SPONSORSHIP OF BILL ON ABSENTEE VOTING IS NOT UNSELFISH, HE AVERS

(By Frank R. Kent)

WASHINGTON.—The vigor and enthusiasm with which the administration is pressing the bill by which it is proposed to have our soldiers and sailors vote this fall for Federal officials only and under Federal supervision is

greater than it has exhibited for any other legislative proposal since we entered the war.

The President has put his full personal strength behind it, as witness his violent and denunciatory message to Congress. If he would do half as much for his national service recommendation, which is far more vital, it might easily go through. Stimulated from the White House, members of his cabinet are actively urging his particular soldier vote bill. But more significant is the eagerness of the White House political aides and fourth-term strategists. As a result the Roosevelt House and Senate leaders, who have been lukewarm to other Presidential recommended measures, are right "up in the collar" on this one.

It would be pleasant to record that all this administration concentration is inspired by the lofty desire that the men in the armed services should not be deprived of their right to vote while fighting for their country, and that there is no political purpose to be served in the Green-Lucas program. But one has to be gullible, indeed, to believe that. Privately, the New Deal politicians make no secret of their expectations from the sort of bill they are pushing. Some of them think that the President's message is the best campaign speech he will make this year. Senator TAFT had grounds for his comment on it.

Once his bill is through, the New Dealers argue, there need be no worry about the success of the fourth-term effort. The soldier vote will put it in the bag. That is their belief and it must be admitted there is considerable ground upon which to base it. One extraordinary pro-Roosevelt advantage is obvious. Clearly the appeal, "Stand by the Commander in Chief," upon which the fourth termers are seeking to justify their attempt, will be much stronger with the men in uniform than with others.

There are two reasons. One is that between the Army special service and the O. W. I. foreign service there is no way to get any political information to the armed forces abroad which the administration thinks undesirable for them to have. The whole business is bottled up, and no amount of breast-beating protests of how pure the hearts of the administration's propagandists and how nonpartisan they intend to be, alters that situation. It is a set-up that precludes anything like an effective presentation of facts unfavorable to a fourth-term candidacy—and there is no use pretending it is not.

There is also consideration that the Army and Navy are always concerned in keeping up morale. From their standpoint, it would seem an evidence of poor morale for the troops to vote against the Commander in Chief while the war is on. There would be a natural disinclination to do that anyhow. Furthermore, it is contended, the high military and naval authorities prefer to have no change and this feeling is certain to seep down through the subordinate officers to the ranks. In brief, an election conducted among the uniformed men, as it is proposed to conduct this one, is a one-sided affair and there is no way to make it otherwise, which is why the fourth termers chortle over the situation. In this view the message was a superb political stroke.

Fully aware of all this, the Republicans and anti-fourth-term Democrats are suffering a good deal of pain. They dislike intensely having the other side put them in the position of opposing the vote for uniformed men. Everybody wants the uniformed men to vote, but that does not make it less distasteful to the Roosevelt opposition to know that wholesale delivery of the uniformed vote to Mr. Roosevelt is being planned. What makes it particularly distasteful is the noble and holy air of being concerned solely with the rights of the servicemen with which the President and his political friends, including Mr. Murray of the C. I. O. are pushing the bill.

Considering the handicaps under which the bill would put them, the Republicans have

been trying to effect a compromise by which, to some degree, these can be nullified. But, whatever the bill's final form, there is no way wholly to offset—(1) the advantage of the Roosevelt position as Commander in Chief; (2) the inability to get to the soldiers with an effective presentation of the failure of Mr. Roosevelt's management of the war on the home front, and the disastrous effects of his lack of a labor policy on the whole war picture. However, these things do not justify refusing the soldiers the vote and, in the end, a bill will be passed. About all the Republicans can do, then, is to make the best of it, though there just will be no way for the Republican candidate to get his case fully before the troops.

With Mr. Roosevelt, of course, there is no necessity to advertise his personality and, if the other side is unable to campaign, his friends think the Commander in Chief argument is about all he needs and that hardly has to be made. That is the way they reason. Of course, a considerable number of soldiers are not yet of voting age; a considerable number will not bother to vote; and a considerable number will vote against Mr. Roosevelt. But, allowing for all that, the advantage still will be with the President. It may not elect him but it certainly will help him.

VOTES FOR SOLDIERS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The other night, after the theater, I dropped in at Lindy's for a sandwich and a cup of coffee. There was a crowd, and as we waited for a table a pretty young woman poked a petition into our faces, asked us to sign, and said it was to get votes for soldiers. I suppose something like that is going on in many places. I was with two intelligent men, both of whom signed this petition, reading it only casually and swiftly.

I asked the young woman what the petition was about. She replied that it was to get Congress to pass the Green-Lucas bill. Now, it took me precisely 3 hours to read and analyze this bill, and then I telephoned a lawyer to check some matters of law for which my education has inadequately prepared me. But this young woman, shouting the slogan, "Vote for soldiers!" assured all and sundry that she knew that it was a good measure and they signed without ever having read the bill, which is, to say the least, unintelligent and foul citizenship.

ABSOLUTE HUMBUG

The young woman said that the Army and Navy were for the bill. I asked her how she knew that, and she replied that Stimson and Knox were for it. When I told her that Stimson and Knox were two Republicans who could not resist taking jobs with the New Deal, in which neither believed, she was very, very doubtful, her knowledge of the political facts of her own country being such as it is.

The slogan, "Votes for soldiers!" in connection with the Green-Lucas bill is absolute humbug. No one is against votes for soldiers, just as no one is against winning the war. No one is opposed to a bill in Congress, within our constitutional structure, which will facilitate the voting by soldiers in the next election. Those who signed these petitions to Congress without reading them are no more for votes for soldiers than those who refused to sign them. The issue in the Green-Lucas bill is not votes for soldiers, but whether the national election of 1944 is to be Tammanized as an incident of the war. The Green-Lucas bill, as at present written, would Tammanize the election. It would do more than that: It would deprive each sovereign State of this American Union of its constitutional right to determine which of its residents shall enjoy the privilege of casting a ballot.

Of course, to many New Yorkers, "the American union of sovereign States" is an alien phrase. They would call it fascism. The fact that it is hallowed by at least two

centuries of American tradition and history does not concern them because American history is alien to them. Even though born and bred in this country, they have gone through schools in which American history and civics are inadequately taught, if at all, and therefore they, poor things, have been deprived of one of the richest heritages of an American citizen, namely, a realization of States' rights within the American Union.

BLINDLY SIGN PETITIONS

They are not as interested in their own State as they are in the fate of Galicia and in the future government of Spain. They are not as concerned with keeping the structure of American representative republicanism as they are with calling decent, patriotic Americans Fascists because they believe in government by constitutional law rather than by the whim of a pleasing and popular personality.

So they blindly sign petitions to Congress without reading them and without knowing what they are about. And they sign a petition to support a bill which not only gives a vote to soldiers but which also deprives a State of a right which is inherent in our system of government and our way of life. They petition not in support of a law which they have read and studied but in favor of a slogan over which there is no disagreement. They sign for the right of a candidate to conduct and supervise his own election, which is precisely what Hitler did when he got himself his present job.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Overton
Andrews	Gillette	Pepper
Austin	Green	Radcliffe
Bailey	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barkley	Hawkes	Robertson
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Smith
Bridges	Jackson	Stewart
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Buck	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lodge	Tobey
Byrd	Lucas	Truman
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Mead	Walsh, N. J.
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Downey	Murdock	White
Eastland	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Nye	Willis
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wilson
George	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the question before the Senate is the Danaher amendment. As I understand the Danaher amendment, it proposes to exempt from the use of the Federal ballot soldiers who are in the United States, unless the State fails to provide an absentee voter's ballot for such soldiers in the United States. It does not in any way modify or affect the Green-Lucas bill or the Federal short ballot as to any of the men who are abroad. That is to say, it does not affect approximately 7,000,000 men who may be abroad by next November,

Mr. President, I intend to vote for the Danaher amendment because I think the people abroad, like the people at home, should use the State ballot and not the Federal ballot; but in my opinion it does not meet in any way the basic question of whether the 7,000,000 men abroad are going to vote the short ballot with no names on it—the so-called Federal ballot—or whether they are going to vote the State ballot from their own homes.

After a great deal of discussion I presented yesterday an amendment which proposes a compromise plan with respect to the soldiers abroad. It has been said by high authority that if we do not pass this bill we shall be denying the soldiers of the United States a vote. The amendment meets that argument, if it is a good argument, because we provide in the amendment that if any State fails before the first of June to approve an adequate absentee voters' law and make the ballots available to the Army and Navy 45 days in advance of the election, the ballots to weigh not more than 1.2 ounces, then the citizens of those States may use the Federal ballot.

The amendment which I originally submitted provided entirely for State ballots, and left the entire matter to the States. Many Senators feel strongly that that is the proper way to deal with the question; and should this amendment be defeated, I shall wish to offer the other amendment as a substitute. However, in order to reach an agreement and compromise with the Senators who feel that some provision should be made, as a practical matter, for the citizens and soldiers from those States where there is no absentee-voters' law, either because of a constitutional provision or because of the refusal of the State to enact such a law, in those cases we would permit a Federal ballot to be used. That is the basis of this amendment.

The amendment leaves the pending bill as it is until we come to page 29. So it leaves effective, in title I, sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 712. It does not change the provisions of the Green-Lucas bill in that respect. Following page 29 of the Green-Lucas bill, it is proposed to substitute for the next 15 pages the provisions of the amendment, through page 44. Then the Green-Lucas bill is accepted as to pages 45, 46, 47, 48, and 49.

The first important change made by the amendment is in the following additional provision, which is not found in the Green-Lucas bill:

This title shall not be applicable after December 31, 1945.

It is usual for us to provide for the termination of wartime legislation with the termination of the war; or on some definite date. I think Congress has concluded that an emergency provision such as this should come to an end at a definite time. If the war is still in progress in 1946, there may be a very different condition. We may know more. We can continue this measure if we desire to do so, or we may enact some other law.

The second provision is:

(d) This title shall not be applicable in the case of the citizens of any State which

has prior to June 1, 1944, made provision for absentee-voting ballots for members of the armed forces, complying with the following conditions:

(1) Such ballots may be used without registration, in person.

(2) Such ballots shall be printed and available for mailing at least 45 days in advance of the election.

(3) Such ballots, with accompanying envelopes and voting instructions, shall weigh not more than 1.2 ounces.

Estimating 4,000,000 ballots, that would mean approximately 300,000 pounds of ballots, or slightly more than 100 tons of ballots. I estimate that at least two-thirds of those ballots, those going to the African and European theaters, can be carried by boat. I see no reason why a swift boat should not be put at the disposal of the ballot commission or the Army and Navy to see that within 5 or 6 days those ballots may reach Europe by boat. The other third, or approximately 35 tons of ballots, would have to be transported by air to more distant parts of the world. I know of no reason why such ballots should not be transported.

I should like to read a letter from an assistant attorney general of the State of New York, Mr. Borden H. Mills. He is not writing in an official capacity, but only in an individual capacity. He represented the New York Ballot Commission in the last election. It may be remembered that New York was almost the only State which succeeded in getting any appreciable number of votes from the soldiers. It received a substantial number of votes from the soldiers in the 1942 election, operating under State law and under Public Law 712. I think more than half of all the soldiers' votes cast were cast in New York.

Mr. Mills says:

I write you as apparently one of the leaders among those who oppose the Green-Lucas-Worley soldiers-vote plan.

I note in particular the summary of the bill as given in the President's message of yesterday, and the President's statement that—

"The inclusion of all the State and local candidates would increase the size and weight of the ballot so as to make air delivery a physical impossibility."

Whoever gave the President the information upon which that argument is based could not have been very familiar with New York law and practice in election matters.

I enclose you herewith an official absentee ballot as used in this State in the last Presidential election to vote for Presidential electors. The State war ballot under our present statutes will be practically identical with this. I am unable to conceive the legality, or countable character, of any smaller or lighter ballot than this. If a soldier is to be permitted to cast a ballot on which no names of candidates appear, but merely the party designations of (I assume) only the two principal parties, then all election laws might just as well be thrown into the discard, and you gentlemen at Washington should pass a short statute empowering the War and Navy Department to take a Gallup poll of the armed forces, merely as to party affiliations (if any) tabulate the result by States, and send it in to the 48 States to be arbitrarily added to the total count on election night.

I also enclose you a ballot for all offices other than Presidential electors, as used in the same election. It should be noticed that the ballot is considerably smaller than the

Presidential elector ballot, and, incidentally, this year it will be smaller yet, because we are electing no State officers, and no Congressmen at Large. How many parties will qualify for a place on the ballot, of course, remains to be seen when nominations are made. Presently only 3 are entitled to a place on the ballot as regular parties, the Republican, Democratic, and American Labor Parties. Others, if they get on, will have to obtain 25,000 signatures, at least 50 in each county of the 62 counties.

As a matter of fact, the so-called State and local ballot this year will be even smaller than it was in 1940, because (1) no State officers at all are to be chosen, (2) no Congressmen at large are to be chosen, and (3) there will be few vacancies in lower offices to be filled because we have a statute relative to "duration" appointments to fill what would otherwise be vacancies in office caused by the incumbents entering the armed forces. Our board of elections estimates that the local ballot this year will be about half the size of the enclosed.

On the question of weight of the ballots, the enclosed Presidential ballot weighs less than an ounce, and in this year the prescribed weight of the ballot will have to be lowered, because we are told that the old weight of paper just cannot be obtained. The opaqueness of ballots was, of course, an important thing when we had paper ballots universally. Now, all ballots cast in person are cast by voting machines, even to the smallest country districts.

The alleged inability of the War and Navy Departments to handle what they call heavy election material is just sheer buncombe, and I hope that someone on the floor of one of the Houses will explode that argument before you get through. Certainly some of the glazed paper propaganda that has gone overseas in the name of the Government was not too heavy to carry, apparently.

The New York War Ballot Commission, of which I was counsel in 1942, heard all about this inability to find room on the ships for ballot supplies, then presented as a War Department alibi. We were finally compelled to send ballots to the few camps that we were able to obtain the A. P. O. address of by first-class mail, and in order to even send this out we had to get a ruling from the Third Assistant Postmaster General, because we were met with the objection that no more than 1 11-pound package could be sent to a single address in any calendar week, whereas we had to send, among others, some 15 such packages to the Twenty-seventh National Guard Division, then in Hawaii, all addressed to the commanding officer.

That shows how this can be done. If all the ballots are sent to the central office of the War Ballot Commission, or mailed there, they can be sorted out by units. It will be known where the unit is going; and if the unit is moved all the ballots for that particular unit can be bundled up and the ballots will follow the unit to wherever it is going. The Army certainly knows where its units are located. The only difficulty would be in the cases of individuals who happened to be transferred within the last 30 days before election; and even in such cases the Army should be able to locate those men if it sincerely tries to do so.

I continue reading:

This is not a partisan question with me. While I am a Republican, I want every soldier entitled to vote, to vote if it is humanly possible. But I do not propose to have the Federal Government telling my State that it will prepare the ballots, have them marked and collected, and send them in to my State, with an implied dare to reject them if the voters are not found qualified under our law.

To offer a man a ballot and tell him that he must take his chances on its being counted is an iniquitous fraud, not only on the State but on the individual voter himself.

Mr. President, my amendment provides for reducing the weight of the ballots to the minimum. I understand that in nearly all States it can be reduced to 1.2 ounces. In some States it may be necessary to change the law to require that all incidental ballots for constitutional amendments, or others, perhaps, be omitted. However, yesterday I saw an Oregon ballot covering a long list of constitutional amendments, as well as including the names of all candidates for State offices, which weighed only approximately six-tenths of an ounce; and when the envelope for it is included, the total weight will be only approximately 1 ounce.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The thing that has puzzled me in regard to this matter is the difficulty in sending the ballots, if they are State ballots, to the soldiers wherever they might be. The Senator has referred to the method used in New York. I believe that method could work well in the case of a unit which had been sent from a State, let us say, to a particular area. But, as the Senator knows, today a regiment may be composed of men from every State. Exactly how would the Senator suggest that, under his amendment, if it should be agreed to, the State ballots would reach men who are so scattered, as I am sure they are?

Mr. TAFT. Under my amendment, as under the House bill, 12,000,000 post cards would be distributed at once, or in July, or at whatever time is specified. They would be scattered throughout the world to every unit. The soldier would put on the post card his address and would send it back. It would ultimately go to his election precinct, and the precinct official would mail the ballot to the address the soldier had given.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the post card have to be mailed to the individual who is to cast the vote?

Mr. TAFT. No. The post cards are to be prepared by the Federal Government, and are to be sent broadcast throughout the world. On approximately the 1st of July, let us say, announcement will be made that in a particular regiment any soldier wanting a post card may get one at whatever place it is decided to have them available. Then all he will have to do will be to sign his name and write his address and age on the post card, and put it in the mail. It will be carried by air mail to the secretary of state of his State, and he will send it to the local election district. Forty-five days before the election the ballots will be ready, and the ballot the soldier requested will be immediately mailed to him.

Mr. ELLENDER. How will it be possible to determine how many post cards to send to any one particular section or place?

Mr. TAFT. So far as the initial post cards are concerned, if there are 2,000 men in a regiment, presumably 2,000

post cards will be sent to that regiment. That is perfectly simple. There would be no trouble about that at all. The application for the ballot will be easy to handle. It will give the address of the man. As we all know, nearly every family has the address of its son who is in the service, and when they write letters to him the letters reach him. There will be no difficulty about that. The ballot will be handled in the same way a letter I write to my son is handled, except that it will be mailed to my son by the election board in Cincinnati, instead of being mailed by me. It will go to the post office in New York, let me say.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can well understand that if the sending of ballots were left to the families, and they were allowed to transmit them, that might be all right. But what puzzles me is where the post cards or ballots are to be sent. It may be necessary, let us say, to send 50 ballots to one place, 100 to another place, and perhaps 2,000 to another place, and then the men may be shifted from one section to another or from one spot to another. The question is, How can we be certain that these men will receive the ballots we wish to send them, or the postal cards, as the Senator has said?

Mr. TAFT. The method of handling the post cards is clear. In every regiment there will be piles of post cards.

Mr. ELLENDER. That will be all right if the post card will be addressed to each soldier.

Mr. TAFT. Oh, no. The post cards which will be available at the various locations of troops will be the post cards of blank soldiers; they will be addressed to the secretaries of the state of blank States, and will be the post cards sent by each soldier to his own election board or to his own secretary of state, who will see that they get to the soldiers' election boards. On that post card the soldier will say, "My address is so and so. Send me a ballot." That is perfectly simple. I do not think any question has ever been raised about the simplicity of that procedure or the fact that any soldier who wants such a post card will be able to send for it.

The question which has been raised is whether, when the soldier sends in the post card, and when the time, 45 days in advance of the election arrives, and when the ballots have been printed and are all ready, and have been mailed to individual soldiers at their given addresses, will the soldiers receive them? I say the soldiers will receive the ballots if the Army wants the ballots to arrive, and if it goes to enough trouble to see that they arrive. That seems to me to be self-evident. Some difficult cases may be encountered; for example, a soldier may be transferred just before the ballot reaches him, and it may be difficult to follow him up. It is true that there will be a small percentage of men whom the ballot will not reach. That is true in the case of all absentee ballots, if the voter has moved after he has given his address. But the fact that the soldier's unit has moved on will make no difference, because the name or number of the soldier's unit will be on the address of the ballot, and the post office or the Army should be able to assemble

all ballots addressed to men in that unit, and see to it that they go in a bundle to that unit, just as the State of New York saw to it that the bundles were sent to the Twenty-seventh Division, which was the New York State Guard.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then, under the Senator's plan, the only soldiers who would be able to vote would be those who applied for the ballot; is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. The soldiers would have to apply. As for the Federal ballot, there will be, so far as we can judge from the telegrams received by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and other Senators, four or five States—or perhaps six—which will not comply with this provision of the law. There may be constitutional objections. The Governors of one or two States have said they would rather leave the matter to the Federal Government, and that they will not call special sessions of their State legislatures. In those cases, the provisions of the Green-Lucas bill would apply, with one exception, namely, that in those cases the soldiers must also apply for ballots. The provision is found on page 6 of my amendment. It is the only substantial change in that respect from the Green-Lucas bill, as to the citizens of five or six States which use the Federal ballot. The language to which I refer reads as follows:

Any person desiring and entitled to vote under the provisions of this title may apply for an official war ballot to the Soldiers' and Sailors' War Ballot Commission, or to the Secretary of War, or to the Secretary of the Navy, or to the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, or to the secretary of state of the State of his residence. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, and the secretary of state of any State, whose citizens may vote under the provisions of this title, receiving such an application, shall promptly transmit any such application to the Commission, and the Commission shall promptly forward an official war ballot to the person requesting the same. The application may be in any form, but for the convenience of persons entitled to vote under this title, the Commission shall prepare a convenient form of application, and distribute the same through the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, to the various stations and ships and localities where persons entitled to vote under this title may be located, such distribution to be made before June 1, 1944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces that the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the unanimous-consent agreement as to time goes into effect.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I will now take my time on the Danaher amendment.

We felt that, rather than try to send Federal ballots broadcast for the citizens of five or six States, it should be provided that they could also apply for the Federal ballot. The Ballot Commission can have stations; it can have piles of ballots in Africa, it can have piles of ballots in England, and if the soldier sends a post card, or if he merely writes a letter, or if he asks his commanding officer for a Federal ballot and says he is from one of the States where he is

entitled to a Federal ballot, then he will get it from the War Ballot Commission. It will be a simpler process than getting it from the State.

The next substantial change is in the form of the ballot. In the form of the ballot on page 3 we have eliminated the possibility of voting by parties. We have not required any names to be placed on the ballot, because the purpose apparently is to transport the ballots before candidates are nominated and to have them printed and to have them uniform.

We have provided that a ballot can be voted only by name. It seems certainly a reasonable provision that, if an elector does not even know the name of the candidates who are running for the office of Member of the House of Representatives or Senator of the United States, he should not be able to vote by simply inserting the word "Democrat" or the word "Republican," and conducting a Gallup poll as to how many Democrats and how many Republicans there are. So this ballot eliminates the possibility of voting by parties. I think in that respect it certainly is a substantial improvement over the bill which is before the Senate.

Mr. President, it was stated in the morning newspapers that we had accepted the Overton amendment, which was defeated yesterday. That is not a true statement in any sense. The only thing that is added to the Green-Lucas bill is found in section 14 (a), which reads:

SEC. 14. (a) The functions and powers of the Soldiers' and Sailors' War Ballot Commission under this act shall be administrative only. Nothing in this act shall be construed to confer a right to vote upon any person who does not possess the qualifications prescribed and defined by State law for electors in the State of his residence.

That does no more than affirm the law and the Constitution, and I think everyone has admitted that, so far as the qualifications of electors are concerned, they are determined by State law. The Overton amendment attempted to say that all State laws with reference to registration and other matters should prevail over the Federal law. That is why it was voted down by the Senate. We have made no such provision in this amendment. It is really a repetition of the first sentence of section 14 (a) of the Green-Lucas bill—

And nothing in this act shall be construed to affect the right of any State to prescribe and define the qualifications of electors entitled to vote in elections held in such State and to determine what persons possess such qualifications.

That, generally stated, is a clear reaffirmation of the existing law and existing Constitution, and it makes it perfectly clear to those Senators who have insisted upon the constitutional question and still feel very strongly that there should be an express statement of what I think myself is implied in the Green-Lucas bill.

Mr. President, we have rewritten title II of the bill and have incorporated as title II the provisions of the House bill. There is every reason to believe that either today or tomorrow the House is

going to adopt the provisions that are included in title II. Title II was also in my proposed substitute, which has been on the desk for a long time. It recommends to the various States the kind of action they should take in order to make it feasible for the State ballot to be transported by the Army and the Navy, including weight, and everything else that is prescribed and it imposes in section 3 an express duty on the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, respectively, to transmit the ballots. I read the section:

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, respectively, to cooperate with appropriate State officers and agencies in transmitting to and from persons to whom this act is applicable, making application therefor to their several States, such absentee ballots, and envelopes to be used in connection therewith, as may be provided under the laws of the several States for the use of such applicants, and to cooperate in the execution by such applicants of oaths in connection with such ballots.

It is provided further, in section (b), on page 21:

The Secretaries of War and Navy, and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, shall take all steps necessary to give to the transmission and delivery of such post cards, ballots, envelopes, and instructions for voting procedure priority over all unofficial communications and priority over official communications except where, in the judgment of the appropriate military and naval authorities, such priority would interfere with the effective prosecution of the war.

That is strong language, but it was used in the Green-Lucas bill as to the Federal ballot but originally omitted as to the State ballot.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. On page 16 of the amendment from which the Senator is reading, line 5, there is a clause reading "to vote by absentee ballot in any primary or general election."

Is not the addition of the primary election something entirely new to the measure we have before us?

Mr. TAFT. It is new to the Green-Lucas bill. The Green-Lucas bill simply made no reference to primaries. This amendment contemplates primaries. There may be an election, not by Federal ballots but by State ballots. The Federal ballot provision is left just as it was in the Green-Lucas bill, but in a primary the State ballot may be used by the State. The only interest of the Federal Government in this aspect is that in case of primary elections it is directed to transmit the ballots as quickly as possible.

Mr. TOBEY. How would the men in the field in Guadalcanal or overseas in the Solomons have access to the names of the various men who are running for nomination in the primaries?

Mr. TAFT. The names would be printed on the ballot. They would be State ballots, and the names, of course, would be printed on them. That is the provision of Public Law 712, which is

now in effect. As we know, there was actual voting in the Louisiana primaries. For some reason I do not understand, the War and Navy Departments were peculiarly anxious to see that all the servicemen from Louisiana got the Louisiana primary ballot if they could possibly get them. They apparently have not been so anxious, or have not been requested, in the case of other States to handle the primary ballot.

I think the Senator from Connecticut read the other day the orders issued by the War Department relating to the handling of the primary ballots of Louisiana. I think time was such that State primary ballots could not reach soldiers abroad and the States did not provide them soon enough to send to soldiers in this country. Under the amendment the War Department would have to see that the servicemen get the primary ballots, and I see no reason why they should not. In many States the primary election is more important than the general election.

I think, Mr. President, that includes in a general way the main features of the amendment. At the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] we changed the name "United States War Ballot Commission" to "Soldiers' and Sailors' War Ballot Commission." That is to obviate the impression which might be given that a Federal ballot can in some way supersede a State ballot.

We have omitted the word "Federal" in every case and called the ballot simply a war ballot.

Mr. President, that is the proposal we make. I suggest that it is an infinitely better bill than the bill without the amendment, which is before the Senate. It has the support of many Members on both sides of this body. It provides in substance that every soldier in the United States Army and every sailor in the United States Navy shall have a vote. He either shall have a State ballot, or, if the State does not provide the ballot in time so that it can be gotten to the soldier or does not amend its law so as to do that, then the soldier will get the Federal ballot, and no soldier can be said in any way to have been denied the right to vote under the plan here proposed.

We hope that this amendment may be offered when the other amendments are disposed of. As I have said, I intend to vote for the Danaher amendment. I should like to eliminate as many people as possible from the Federal ballot, but it does not in any way meet the basic question of whether the 7,000,000 men abroad are going to be asked to vote on a ballot with no names on it for men of whom they have never heard. The thing that impresses me most with the so-called Federal ballot is that, obviously, the men will know the names of Presidential candidates on the Democratic and Republican tickets. Obviously, 90 percent of them will not know the names of candidates for Senator and Representative, and the election of the Members of Congress will simply be subordinated to the election of the President.

Reference has heretofore been made to the tremendous C. I. O. propaganda.

I have been stopped in every hallway, by crowds sent here at the expense of the C. I. O. political action committee to lobby in favor of the Green-Lucas bill, and I think their principal desire is to go after Congress, to deprive Congress of its independence, to make the election of Congress simply dependent upon the election of the President. Any man who votes for President on the Democratic ticket is more than likely to vote "Democratic, Democratic" for the other two. If he is a Republican he is likely to vote "Republican, Republican." They will simply have the election of Congress subordinated in every possible way to the choice of a President.

None of us is a prophet, and we do not know what will happen, but I venture to say that if there is one thing that is absolutely essential, whoever may be elected President, it is that the Congress which succeeds us shall be as independent as this Congress, that it exercise its own judgment, that the men in it shall stand because of their own records, because of their names, because of the work they have done, and not because they happen to belong to the Republican or Democratic Party.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The Senator was discussing the buttonholing of Members of Congress that is going on in the reception rooms and in the lobbies. A few days ago a group of about a dozen or more called me out of the Chamber and, one might say, "put the heat on" for the Green-Lucas bill. But when I asked if any of them had read the bill and knew what it provided, it developed that none of them had actually read it.

Mr. TAFT. That would apply to a good many lobbyists I happen to have seen since I came to Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, as modified, to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. TAFT. Just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. TAFT. Will not the Senator withhold the suggestion until the Senator from Minnesota can have an opportunity to speak?

Mr. BALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Butler	George
Andrews	Byrd	Gerry
Austin	Capper	Gillette
Bailey	Caraway	Green
Ball	Chandler	Guffey
Bankhead	Chavez	Gurney
Barkley	Clark, Idaho	Hatch
Blibo	Clark, Mo.	Hawkes
Bone	Connally	Hayden
Brewster	Danaher	Hill
Bridges	Davis	Holman
Brooks	Downey	Jackson
Buck	Eastland	Johnson, Colo.
Burton	Ellender	Kilgore
Bushfield	Ferguson	La Follette

Langer	O'Mahoney	Tobey
Lodge	Overton	Truman
Lucas	Pepper	Tunnell
McCarran	Radcliffe	Tydings
McClellan	Reed	Vandenberg
McFarland	Revercomb	Wagner
McKellar	Reynolds	Wallgren
Maloney	Robertson	Walsh, Mass.
Maybank	Russell	Walsh, N. J.
Mead	Shipstead	Wheeler
Millikin	Smith	Wherry
Moore	Stewart	White
Murdock	Taft	Wiley
Murray	Thomas, Idaho	Willis
Nye	Thomas, Okla.	Wilson
O'Daniel	Thomas, Utah	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota, as modified, to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. TAFT. I will ask the Senator to withhold that request a moment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment to the Danaher amendment which I offered yesterday, and which is the pending business. It is included in the more comprehensive amendment which the Senator from Ohio has just discussed, and I think his amendment is a much better form in which to present the issue to the Senate. Therefore I shall support his amendment, and I withdraw the pending amendment to the Danaher amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota to the so-called Danaher amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have had nothing to say in this very embarrassing situation which has arisen in the Senate. I never thought it possible that in the Senate of the United States there would be a serious effort to circumvent the Constitution. All of us know what the purpose is, and it is not necessary for me to state it. It is proposed that a blank ballot be sent out, and whatever party name shall be on it, the vote of the individual will be counted for that party.

Mr. President, that is not what I particularly rose to say. The Senate of the United States represents the States, the House of Representatives represents the people. That was the arrangement arrived at in the Constitutional Convention.

Here we are, Mr. President, representing the sovereign States to whom absolute power is given to control voting. I was surprised when the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] yesterday indicated that he was trying to get the real honest-to-God American Governors of the States to enter into a fraud with him. The attempt to defend the right of the States to control the voting has been denominated a fraud. Now the Senator from Virginia is trying to get the Governors of sovereign States to enter into a fraudulent transaction with him. That, Mr. President, is another conspiracy of which he is guilty. He conspired before, so it was alleged, to try to save the Constitution. Now he enters into another conspiracy to try to defeat the attempt to control the election along certain

lines. I do not know what is to become of HARRY BYRD. I nominated him for President. [Laughter.] I said then that even with so heavy a handicap he may stand a chance.

Senators, it is discouraging to see this body take 2 or 3 weeks to discuss the question whether or not Congress has the power to determine the qualifications of voters. I simply do not believe that half the Members of this body have read the Constitution. If they have they do not know how to interpret it.

Mr. President, the question with which we are confronted today is serious, the most serious with which we have been confronted in the history of America, for suddenly the attempt is made to tamper with the Constitution, the guide which has led us for all these years, which has worked against us at times, as we thought, but under which we have the most glorious form of government that ever blessed mankind.

Mr. President, how many of us have read the Constitution and the decisions of the Supreme Court rendered at a time when it was a Supreme Court—I mean the decisions of a real Supreme Court—respecting the twilight zone where the rights reserved to the States seemed to merge and make the situation indistinct, and where the designated powers began? In those decisions the Supreme Court interpreted the Constitution and led us without conflict until now. Yet here we are trying to depart from the precedents of more than 150 years, in order to accomplish—what? We had 2,000,000 men in the service during the last war, and I did not hear of the country going to the demimoon bow-wows because they did not vote.

Of course, Mr. President, every man wants the soldier to vote. I want everyone to do so who is eligible to vote. Does any Senator in his heart of hearts believe that there has been anyone who desired to take the vote away from the soldier? An effort has been made to show that the Republican Party was the conspirator trying to block this great humanitarian purpose, and deny the soldier the vote. I do not know how it has happened, but things have turned about so that a Republican begins to look pretty good to me. [Laughter.] Yes, Mr. President, he does. I actually am getting to the point where I turn to the Republicans instinctively when I want the real fundamental constitutional laws of this country adhered to. If that is a tribute to them, why I hold my nose and make it. [Laughter.] I positively have fallen so low in the political cesspool that the Republican Party looks pretty good to me. And if they will keep on, and stop playing the fool, as we have, and unite on the proper man, they stand a chance of going into the worst mess that ever a party was called upon to go into and clean up—the humanitarian men of the present administration.

Mr. President, I am a Democrat, born and bred. I am not a Democrat not so much because of the differences between the Republican platforms and the Democratic platforms, but I am a Democrat because of the infamy that was placed on my section of the country during the

horrible days of reconstruction. From indications now it looks as if an attempt is being made to perpetrate the same thing again. Thank God, it will not fall upon the South alone when it comes. Some of the others of you will taste the joys that will come because of those who are usurping the principles of our Government.

I have been heartsick at seeing this debate on a constitutional question. Those who are talking about the Constitution would not know it from the Bill of Rights. No, Mr. President, they do not know what it is. All they want to know is, "Can we get a vote?" Anyone who will read the debate carefully, and see who are the authors of the original bill, and whom they quote, can know exactly at what the green locust—I mean the Green-Lucas—bill is directed.

I consider it a disgrace to the Senate that those of us who really love the Constitution, and love our Government, as distinguished from every other government in the world, have actually debated with these green locusts—I mean the proponents of the bill—whether the measure was constitutional or not. A man ought to be ashamed of himself to rise on this floor and try to prove that it is constitutional to let anyone but the States fix the qualifications. I know that one of the hopes was that they would get rid of the poll tax as a requirement for voting, and, if they cannot do it one way, by God, they will do it another. That is one of the things that the bill was directed toward.

Mr. President, I received a card from a Massachusetts man showing me what happens with respect to the poll tax in Massachusetts. I wish I had brought it to the Senate, so I could read it now. It was to this effect:

This is your last notice. You either pay your poll tax or you go to jail. The time is limited, and I mean what I say.

I think the tax was three dollars and some cents. Mr. President, I have sat here for a number of years, and I say that every single move that has been made, if Senators will sift it properly, will be found to be an effort to avoid the constitutional limitation and "Let me run this country as I want to run it."

The insult was thrown at the Senate that we had been party to a fraud; the Chief Executive said to the Senate, "You may not be guilty yourself, but you are parties to a fraud."

Mr. WHERRY. I voted for that "unholy alliance."

Mr. SMITH. The Senator says he voted for that "unholy alliance." Well, he will be punished for it in due time. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. President, what I wish to impress on this body is that we should let the Governors of the States—as was indicated here by the "chief conspirator" [laughter] have their legislatures so modify their laws as to have their State ballots sent to their citizens abroad.

Mr. President, what is the difficulty? What is the difference between sending a State ballot and sending a bobtailed Presidential ballot? The ballots must reach the soldiers, in either case. I be-

lieve the Governors of 43 or 45 States responded to the invitation to "perpetrate a fraud on the American people." I believe the Governors of 45 States responded to the invitation. Just let the States so modify their laws that the State ballots will be sent to the soldiers.

Mr. President, what is more sacred than the election of a Senator? Do you think it is as important to elect a Senator as it is to elect a President? I have come to the conclusion that perhaps it is more important under present conditions to elect a President; he assumes legislative, judicial, and executive power, so that all of us might just as well take a recess when we get a President a little more imbued with the idea of omniscience. [Laughter.]

The thing for us to decide is whether we are going to stand by our oath: "I hereby solemnly swear that I will maintain the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, both foreign and domestic"—and then later in the oath—"without any mental reservation." Senators who do not care anything about their oaths can vote for this miserable thing, and throw the whole Government out of kilter.

I wish to say here, although I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet, that just as certain as the bill is passed and the ballots are returned according to the terms of the bill, it may bring about civil war. Senators who have not studied the bill carefully will find that that is not an improbable prophecy.

Let us all get together and vote to recognize the constitutional right of the States to qualify their voters. That is what the substitute provides. Senators who vote against the substitute will be voting to throw the United States into probable chaos.

Mr. President, I do not feel well today. I wish I did, so that I might express myself as this situation demands.

Yesterday the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] dragged into the debate one of those old things that have been outlawed and forgotten—a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States that the States have the exclusive right. The idea of the Senator's reading that kind of thing before this august body. [Laughter.] Why, good gracious alive. A fairy tale that the States have any rights.

Yes, Mr. President, my platform is—and I repeat it now—

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit an interruption, let me say that that opinion of the Supreme Court, delivered by Mr. Chief Justice Fuller, was not only his opinion but was the unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. SMITH. The unanimous opinion of those other fossils.

Mr. McKellar. And it has never been questioned, either since that time or before.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator mean, when he says "unanimous opinion," that it was the unanimous opinion of all those old fossils? [Laughter.]

Mr. McKellar. All those gentlemen.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; all those who are now relegated to the nether realm.

Why, Mr. President, just compare the present Supreme Court to those old figureheads. [Laughter.]

We are in a fine condition, with a glorious Senate and a super Supreme Court. It is a wonder that we are not translated to heaven, if there is one.

I warn this body now that unless we vote to act in accordance with the Constitution, and give the States the right to provide for State ballots, the result will be chaos. If the States do not exercise that right, then the responsibility will rest on them.

Mr. President, who sent us here? The States. We represent them. If a State does not provide for an absentee-ballot law to suit the occasion, the responsibility will rest on that State, and its people will hold responsible those who did not cooperate. But that is not what this crowd wants. You know it, Mr. President, and I know it. This crowd does not want to States to cooperate. Why, Mr. President, that miserable South Carolina has a requirement that a voter shall pay a poll tax! That miserable State should not be allowed to have a voice in this great movement on the part of this august body—South Carolina, one of the Thirteen Original States, whose sons have had something to do with the Constitution.

The Senator from Nebraska has heard of the Constitution; has he not?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I have heard of it.

Mr. SMITH. Yes. [Laughter.]

Well, South Carolinians had something to do with the framing of the Constitution; and yet that miserable State has a law requiring the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting—a law passed during the reconstruction days by a Negro legislature. If anyone doubts the accuracy of that statement, I will send him the record of the fact that the poll tax was introduced by a Negro legislature, and that the law providing for it was signed by a — carpetbag Governor! [Laughter.] And now we are to be punished for what they did!

I do not know whether the poll tax should be made a prerequisite to voting, but I do know that so long as the law of my State provides for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting, I will observe that law.

Today we do not have the proper qualifications for electors, and it is evident from every standpoint. I think one of the greatest mistakes which ever was made was when this country took away from the legislatures the right to elect Senators, and turned that right over to the hoi polloi, the vox populi. That was at least one method of sifting. I know that sometimes there was terrible corruption, but not half so much corruption as there is in the present form of election. I can state emphatically that had it been left to the legislatures, the Senate would not have had the splendid presence of the present senior Senator from South Carolina. I do not think I would ever have been sent here, and perhaps that would have been a blessing.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no.

Mr. SMITH. But I do pray God that we may be men enough to stand here today and resist all efforts to camouflage the situation, and that we may vote that the States shall have the right to send ballots to their soldiers. What other rights do they have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFarland in the chair). The Chair is compelled to inform the Senator that his time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. SMITH. Then, Mr. President, I have 20 minutes remaining, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 20 minutes on the bill.

Mr. SMITH. Very well; I shall speak on the bill.

God knows, I wish I felt at liberty to state just what I feel. I am afraid I would make someone angry and have a physical fight. It is bad enough to try to fight mentally.

Can we not all get together and maintain the fundamental laws of our country? This thing has been going on for quite a while. It will be remembered that some time ago an effort was made to pack the Supreme Court. Providence intervened and made it possible without an act of Congress. An effort was made to enact a law abolishing the poll tax. We have degenerated to the point where it is no longer an honor to be called a United States Senator.

When such things go on as have gone on here for the past 10 days it is enough to make a man ashamed to be an American citizen; let alone being a Senator. Speech after speech is made saying that the poor soldier will not get a chance to vote. The State is not going to let him vote; therefore the superstate will step in, the Constitution to the contrary notwithstanding, and see that he does vote.

Bobby Burns has a phrase in his advice to his young friend which I think every one of us should memorize and keep always before us. He said in his Epistle to a Young Friend:

The fear o' hell's a hangman's whip
To hand the wretch in order;
But where ye feel your honour grip,
Let that ay be your border:
Its slightest touches, instant pause—
Debar a' side-pretences;
And resolutely keep its laws,
Uncaring consequences.

It is a test of manhood to believe firmly and stand by that belief against all comers. I think certain illustrations from the Bible will demonstrate the condition of some of us. I think of the three Hebrew children in the fiery furnace. Of course no such thing ever occurred; but it is a fine illustration of a man devoted to his principles standing in the fire of temptation.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator remember their names?

Mr. SMITH. Shadrach, Meshech, and Abednego.

I have stood against temptation and flattery—not much flattery, but a little—and against all denunciation. Thank God, I am without the smell of fire.

We are in a terrible condition. With some the question is not, Shall I serve

my country, maintain the Constitution, and demand that the reserved rights of the States shall be preserved? but What can I get out of it?

As I have stated many times previously, we have more "patriots" today than we ever had in the history of America. The word is spelled a little differently, but pronounced the same. It is spelled "p-a-y-t-r-i-o-t-s." It used to be spelled "p-a-t-r-i-o-t-s."

Having served in this body longer than any other man, I plead with my fellow Senators, for God's sake, no matter what you do, maintain the Constitution, or submit its amendment to the people and be governed by their decision.

We are going to vote on this question, and there will be amendments. I for one shall vote for the States to have the full opportunity to regulate the suffrage of their citizens abroad as well as those at home. When the soldier went into the Army he did not forsake his State. Most of them love their State laws as much as I love the laws of my State.

A substitute bill has been proposed which has in it the very essence of what I am pleading for. A witness appeared before our committee and said, "Gentlemen of the committee, I have a written statement." I said, "No; you cannot make it." He said, "It covers the ground." I said, "That may be, but if you are a worthy witness you can answer 'yes' or 'no.' We will have no prolonged written statements." I understand that some of such statements come here with the stamp of the Executive on them, if they are not actually written by the Executive.

I plead with my fellow Senators to remember their oaths. Is there a Senator who considers his oath not worth a "cuss"? We stand up and solemnly swear, before God and our country, that we will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. I thank God that the word "domestic" is used because some of the bitter enemies of our Constitution are here in America. You all know it, and I know it. It is up to us who are faithful to sustain it, and not enter into this—I was about to say public-school debate, but I do not want to have to apologize to the public schools.

The vote is soon to come. I have heard some Senators say, "I think I shall vote thus and so." Oh, yes; "I think I shall vote as the boss said." You are a fraud. Now, by God, take your medicine. He said you were a fraud. Now act your part. Any man who has enough red blood in him to resent an insult, if he could not vote against the bill, would not vote for it.

This is no ordinary slur on the Senate. It did not come from Ed SMITH, KENNETH McKELLAR, or JOHN BANKHEAD. It came from the Chief Executive, charging that we had committed a fraud. I never cast a fraudulent vote in my life. I never considered any vote as glorious as the one which I cast for the Eastland amendment. It was in accordance with the Constitution, and my platform. I have cast votes which have turned out to be fraudulent, but I was not aware of it at the time. I voted for Franklin D. Roose-

velt twice; and I leave it to the Senate to say whether or not that turned out to be a fraudulent vote.

I may continue until I reach the point where someone will say, "Let us impeach him." Go ahead. If that be treason, make the most of it. I am speaking for my country, and neither he nor any other man can stop me, for when we took the crown from the head of King George we placed it on the head of every worthy American citizen. So help me God, I will not doff my crown for him or any other man, so long as I remain an American citizen.

Senators, let us all rise to the occasion. A Member of this body once said that in a certain situation he would rise above principle. Let us rise to the stature of a constitutional Senate, one which, no matter what comes or what goes, will disregard all pretense and resolutely face the consequences.

It is up to us to vindicate the name of the Senate, which has been smeared by every racketeer and jackass columnist. Every one of them takes a fling at it, and instead of our resenting it, we swallow it, and have done so for such a long time that we are guilty of what they say of us.

Senators, for God's sake, let us vote like men, like representatives of the States. The Senate is not like the House of Representatives. The Senate represents the States.

I want all Senators to understand that I have not made the speech I should like to make. Perhaps some day I may do so.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, for many days we have been engaged in a discussion of the pending bill, and the discussion is one which has been beneficial throughout the Nation. I believe that the people of this country have considered the question with reference to the right of the soldiers to be given some method of voting as they have never considered the question before.

It is unfortunate that during the discussion there were appeals to prejudice instead of to reason and common sense. It is unfortunate that there were those who took occasion to vent their pet spite on the President of the United States. I very much doubt whether such remarks do the President much harm, or do much good to those who utter them. I suspect that they do not.

The President of the United States is my President, and if in the judgment of the people of this Nation a Republican President should be elected next fall, he will be my President, and I would support the President of the United States, no matter to what party he might belong. I propose to support the President of the United States, particularly in time of war. I do not propose to sneer at the Government of the United States or any part of the Government.

We have heard sneers at the Supreme Court of the United States. Even the names of those who have dared to introduce bills in the Senate of the United States have been sneered at, and slurs cast at their names and the pronunciation of their names. Yet, such conduct does not solve the problem.

Today we have been asked if we are going to refuse the boys in the Army and Navy the right to vote. We are told that no one wants to do that. The boys are already in a position where they cannot vote. It is only a question of whether we will remedy the situation by listening to sneers and insulting remarks made to the Senate with reference to the various branches of the Government. What are we here for? Are we here to provide a remedy for a situation which exists, or are we here to sneer, laugh, and criticize?

The Government of the United States has taken away from soldiers their opportunity to vote. It now seems that a widespread attempt is being made on the part of some to make it appear that the fight is one between the Federal Government and the State governments. There is no such fight.

Yesterday we were told that the proposed amendments would not take away any rights which would be given under the original Green-Lucas bill. Mr. President, I assert that they would take the right to vote from every man in the armed service, or nearly so.

Some of the amendments which have been offered would go only a part of the way. If the purpose in offering them is to prevent the servicemen from voting, and if that is what is meant by compromise, then it is a compromise. It would take away only a part of the voting opportunities, and not all.

Mr. President, Senators whom I have never before heard mention the Constitution in this Chamber have suddenly become exercised about it. They are afraid that some question will be raised as to the constitutionality of an act which would give to the soldiers an opportunity to vote. That is what they are afraid of, but they do not say one word about the fear expressed by some that this body will not do what it can do and ought to do to give the soldiers an opportunity to vote. Such a thought has never seemed to dawn upon them. Why? Because the discussion has deteriorated from one concerning a method of giving the boys an opportunity to vote to the question of how they are going to vote.

Men stand and sneer at the name of a possible candidate for President of the United States. It is not the duty of this body to determine for whom the soldiers are to vote. Let them vote in the way their consciences dictate, but give them an opportunity to vote. The fight should not be between the Nation and the States, as it has developed here, or between the Federal Government and the State governments. Let us pass a bill which will give to the members of the armed forces an opportunity to vote if they come from States which do not provide such opportunity.

Perhaps we are wrong. Perhaps opportunity to vote will be provided by the States. I do not think it will be provided. With 48 States, with 3,000 different counties, and I do not know how many election districts, I do not think it is possible, in most instances, or in many instances, to use the ballot which has been used heretofore.

Earlier today the Senator from Ohio said, referring to Public Law 712, "Well,

the State of New York had pretty nearly half the number of ballots that were cast." How many did the State of New York have? We are told that altogether 28,000 ballots were cast, and that the State of New York had perhaps approximately one-half of that number. That represents the opportunity which the boys of the State of New York were given. But why do we not have both the State ballot and the Federal ballot? If the pending bill should become law, what would prevent the States from passing their own ballot laws? I presume that many States are in the same position my State is in.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The States' rights issue has been raised throughout the debate. I should like to have any Senator tell me how the States, without the cooperation of the Federal Government, could carry into effect any method or procedure now provided by any single State insofar as it affects any soldier, sailor, or marine who is fighting outside the continental limits of the United States. In other words, the opponents of the bill cry out against the encroachment of the Federal Government upon the rights of the States. But the same group that makes that argument is depending upon the Federal Government to carry out the wishes of the States insofar as voting is concerned when the boys go overseas outside the continental limits of the United States.

Mr. TUNNELL. And the Army and Navy say that the possibility of being able to do so is a remote one.

Mr. President, I do not see the reason for all this outcry as to States' rights if those who make it sincerely desire to give the servicemen a vote. As I said when the so-called Eastland bill was passed, it was a subterfuge. I did not say "fraud," but I said it was a subterfuge. There is nothing in it but a piece of advice. Those who support it go to the trouble of passing a piece of advice on the part of the Federal Government as to what the States should do. It was a subterfuge, it is a subterfuge, and it has not fooled anybody. I think the President probably used the wrong word when he said "fraud." It is too palpable to fool anybody and so far it has not fooled anybody but 42 United States Senators. [Laughter.]

The boys who are in the Federal service are entitled to vote. I care not what fear may be expressed, I care not what else may be said, those boys are entitled to the right to vote. If the Federal Government has the right to take them and send them to every corner of the globe under conditions where, Mr. President, you know and I know the State ballot cannot or will not reach them, the Federal Government is under obligation to do what it can to furnish them the opportunity to vote. If the Federal Government had nothing to do with the circumstances it would still have the obligation.

It is all right to stand up and sneer at these boys. We have heard even that. In a former debate one Senator, in a

sneering manner, referred to "these precious boys." These boys are indeed precious. You have one there and I have one there, and almost everybody else has one there and some have more than one; so it is not a joking matter, and any such order of levity should be promptly dissipated.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me in his time to read a letter from a soldier who has been overseas for 18 months?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I read as follows:

There certainly has been plenty of talk about the soldiers' vote here and all over. Seems some Senator got up and said that the boys would not miss their vote half as much as they would miss the Varga girl, and baby, what a row that started. The mail bag was full of mail saying what and who does that Senator think he is? The Stars and Stripes had a poll on the streets of Algiers, and out of the 20 fellows interviewed, all but 1 said that they would very much miss the vote if they were not allowed to vote. If we are not allowed to vote, I, for one, will certainly feel that something has been put over on me.

In other words, that is how we soldiers of the last war felt when we came back and found prohibition had been put over on us while we were away.

I am sure that by being drafted into the Army and coming overseas I did not forfeit my rights as a citizen. I also feel, that now more than ever, I should have a voice in who shall run the country for the next 4 years. I feel that after seeing the things I have seen, being to the places I've been, that I am better qualified to vote than most of the people back home. I don't mean that just because I am in the Army and have had to give up things that they didn't that I have more right to a vote than they. I mean that I think that I have a better idea of what the next 4 years will be like and therefore know what a candidate's policy should be.

Mr. President, there is the crux of the situation. Last night I heard a man say that the soldier did not know what was going on at home and therefore should not have the right to vote. I undertake to say that the men in the armed forces today know more about what this weary old world is doing than any other 11,000,000 men of any single class in America, whether they be farmers, laborers, merchants, or any other class of citizens.

I am reminded of what General Sherman said in the Civil War in writing to the President of the United States. He said the stay-at-homes should not have any right to vote. It was only the man carrying the musket either in the Confederate or in the Union Army who should have the right to vote. I would not go so far as General Sherman went, but that is exactly how he felt about it in those days, and the soldiers and sailors and marines of this war are feeling exactly as the writer of the letter from which I read feels. They are feeling it more and more and more as this bill is debated day after day on the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives. They will vote either now or sometimes just as surely as there is a God in heaven as a result of what we are doing here.

They probably would have paid little attention to this bill had it passed in its original form, but they believe now that there are certain groups in this country who, for one reason or another, do not want the servicemen to vote, as a result of the tactics which have been employed, including all the different legislative methods which have been crowded one on top of the other for the sole purpose of defeating a Federal ballot. They have a right to come to that conclusion.

If they do not get the vote, there will come from these boys in every section of the world to the folks at home a great barrage of letters wanting to know why the Congress of the United States dared to refuse to give them in the greatest crisis the Nation has ever faced a part, if you please, in representative government, which is the very thing they are fighting for.

O Mr. President, this is just the beginning of the fight. It will not end for years to come, unless these boys are given a real chance to vote. Whether they vote or not is immaterial. I have said I do not care how they vote. Perhaps that is not true; I should say it is none of my business how they vote. I have taken that attitude from the beginning of the consideration of this bill. I have compromised; I have amended; I have agreed to amendments; I have done everything within my power, as one of the co-authors of the bill, to frame a measure upon which the Congress of the United States would agree. But, notwithstanding all efforts, we still have this interminable delay in the passage of a measure providing a uniform Federal ballot system in cooperation with the States, under title II, and designed to give the serviceman a real chance to vote. Regardless of what happens, I shall always know that I did my conscientious duty in a crisis that threatens the lifeblood of the Nation.

I thank the Senator from Delaware for yielding.

Mr. TUNNELL. I thank the Senator. The question before the Senate is a serious one. I received a letter a few days ago from a boy in a foreign country who now wears the uniform. He said, "You may put this down. We are coming home, and we are going to vote when we come back." Those who think that they are fooling the boys in uniform are just fooling themselves.

The President of the United States and the Supreme Court are not the only ones who have been sneered at in connection with the vote. The boys themselves have had sneers hurled at them. We have been told that they are going to be herded to the polling places and voted, as if they were not men of intelligence, and capable of marking their ballots and knowing what they were voting for. We have been told that they will be marched up in line to the polls to vote, just as if these boys were not men of ordinary intelligence. They had to pass some kind of an examination in order to get into the Army; yet from the remarks made on the floor of the Senate by those who seek to defeat the Federal ballot plan, these boys are not capable of looking

after their interests in the matter of voting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TRUMAN in the chair). The Senator's time on the amendment has expired. Does he desire to proceed on the bill?

Mr. TUNNELL. I shall proceed for a few minutes on the bill.

I know I should not take up a great deal of time, but it seems to me that we have reached a point where someone has to say something for those who are not here. As to those who think that the boys are going to be herded, those who think they are going to be marched up in line and voted, I do not know what sort of an idea of elections they have, or think the American people have. I have not received a single letter or a single postal from any human being asking me to keep the servicemen from voting, or to defeat a bill by which they are likely to be given an opportunity to vote. I have not received one such letter and I doubt that other Senators are in any different position from mine in that respect.

Mr. President, there is constantly being dinned into the ears of the American people, and brought to their attention through certain writers in the press, that this bill is for a particular candidate, that there is something unfair about it. I think the authors of the bill have shown every willingness to accept amendments to the bill, and I am sure they want to be fair, and have but one purpose, that is, to give an opportunity to the soldiers to vote.

I listened to the Senator from Virginia yesterday when he read the telegrams from the various Governors, and that is all fine, but those Governors have not been in the Committee on Privileges and Elections, they have not heard the testimony as to the difficulty involved in the delivery of the ballots.

The Senator from Connecticut stated yesterday that there were practical physical difficulties with respect to the State ballot. I notice that one or two others made the same statement, among them the Senator from Minnesota. So that it comes down to this, that there is no absolute assurance that a Federal ballot will be delivered, and there is only a remote possibility of the State ballots being delivered.

Mr. President, I have here the Danaher amendment as it is printed. I object to the Danaher amendment in its present form, for the reason, in the first place, that it gives no opportunity to the boys in the service of the United States to vote. It is all right to say that the States are going to do something to remedy that, but suppose they do not.

I notice that the Governor of my own State is quoted as saying:

Replying to your telegram, State now has absentee-voter law for qualified voters. Certain changes required for oversea voting. Special session of legislature contemplated for necessary amendments to law.

It takes more than slight amendments. Through our whole system of voting there is woven a provision as to the time when the ballots have to be ready, and when the tickets have to be filed. It is not necessary to file the tickets until 20 days before the election, but they must

be printed, in this situation, in every voting district in the State in order that they may be sent out. Then there are the postal cards from the boys asking for the ballots, and the return of the ballots after voting, and about 10 days is the extent of the time allowed for the transfer.

I do not know how many States are in the same position as the State of Delaware; but, according to the telegram, the Governor of Delaware has not yet realized what would have to be done, and when we attempt to remedy everything standing in the way of the servicemen voting, and when the remedy must be applied in 48 different States, it will be found to be an impossibility. I plead with the Senators, do not throw that into the faces of our boys fighting for the Nation in foreign countries.

Mr. President, I wish to read paragraph 3 of the Danaher amendment:

Members of the armed forces who are inside the United States who are residents of any State of which the secretary of state has not certified to the Commission prior to August 1, 1944, that the State has made provision for such members to vote by absentee ballot * * *.

The secretary of state of Delaware can truthfully make that affidavit now. Yet boys any considerable distance away from Dover, the capital, could not vote. There must be the various transfers of postal cards and ballots, and the delivery of the executed ballot, and it has to pass through various hands.

One of the Senators stated yesterday, "Oh, yes; if they do not deliver them, you can go into court and attack the secretary of state for making a false affidavit." The Delaware secretary of state is not making a false affidavit—he is telling the truth—when he says that the State has an absentee-ballot law.

He has to say, further, that the State will accept post card applications, as provided in title II of the act. He can make the certification that there is such an absentee-ballot law in truth, and yet the boys will not be allowed to vote, no matter if they are only a short distance from home.

In the first place, I think something should be done so that the boys who are in the United States, not in foreign countries, should have the right to use the Federal ballot if they do not receive the State ballot. Then, again, I think there should be something more required of the secretary of state than simply for him to say that a ballot law is on the statute books of Delaware without saying whether it is adequate, without saying how long it will take for a boy to send the application and the ballot as it is completed and voted from the place where he is located nearby, let us say, Washington, or wherever he happens to be. It seems to me the Danaher amendment in its present form is not sufficient. I oppose it in its present form.

Mr. President, our people are sacrificing much. They are entitled to have the Senate pass legislation making it possible for their boys to vote. The people of the Nation are entitled to have the servicemen vote. As I said a few days ago, the 11,000,000 who are now in service repre-

sent one-fifth of the voting population of the Nation as it expressed itself in 1940.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I will say to the Senator that I have prepared language which modifies in part the Danaher amendment, as the Senator refers to it. It derives from a colloquy between my colleague [Mr. MALONEY] and me yesterday. In due course I shall present that language to modify my amendment, and my amendment, as thus modified, will be complete. I am sure the Senator from Delaware when he sees it will realize that it coincides with his present thinking.

Mr. TUNNELL. I will ask the Senator from Connecticut if he thinks it meets the two objections I have made.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; I am sure it does.

Mr. TUNNELL. Very well. The Danaher amendment has many good points. I think it has a good purpose. But I think it needs curing in two respects, which I conceive to be fatal defects.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIS obtained the floor.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Yesterday my distinguished colleague engaged in colloquy with me while I was explaining the amendment which is now the pending question. He pointed out that it is quite easily possible that a member of the armed services might be stationed, let us say, at Camp McClellan, he might have applied for a State ballot and might thereafter have been transferred, let us say, to Fort Knox, and his State ballot might never reach him. It might indeed be that the absentee would be transferred to Fort Lewis, or across the United States, and in the various transfers his State ballot would not in fact catch up with him. Under those circumstances, as my colleague pointed out, it seemed to him quite appropriate that we should make some provision that such an absentee, who does not receive his State ballot, be permitted to vote. Insofar as it lies within our power, therefore, to cure that situation, the use of the so-called uniform Federal war ballot provided under title I would accomplish the result.

To the end, Mr. President, that my pending amendment may properly be modified to cover this point, I send forward a modification, and amend my amendment in the particular, and for the information of Senators present I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the modification.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to modify the amendment on page 2, after line 12, by adding "any such member of the armed forces who is inside the United States and who has not received his State ballot may vote under the provisions of this title, provided such member shall execute the oath hereinafter set forth."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, that particular modification refers to an oath later to be set forth. On page 31 of the

bill is to be found a printed form of oath which is to be printed in full on the outside of the official inner envelope. In due course it will be my purpose, if my amendment, as modified, shall prevail, to offer a further amendment modifying the form of oath, after the word "suffrage" to insert "(For use only in the United States)," with the clause, "I have not received my State ballot." The language in the bracket and that clause will then form a part of the oath which the absentee soldier will take, and the certificate of the attesting officer, as the language of the Lucas-Green bill makes clear, will give to the official envelope containing the ballot prima facie status of validity.

Mr. President, I think with that brief explanation the Senator from Delaware in due course will find that his objectives indeed have been met.

I yield to my colleague, with the permission of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WILLIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that the language which my able colleague proposes to add to his original amendment meets the objections which I expressed yesterday, and that the amendment which he will offer providing the one now pending prevails, completely answers the question which was disturbing me yesterday.

I should like to add that I am very hopeful that the amendment will be accepted by the authors of the bill and by the Senate.

I thank my colleague.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I appreciate the cooperation of my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has the floor and the Chair will say to him that his time will begin now.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me so I may make a 2-minute speech?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am grateful to the Senator from Indiana because what I say will be said in his time.

I simply wish to add a word or two to what the two distinguished Senators from Connecticut have said. This morning I read in the Record the colloquy between the two Senators from Connecticut, and I also heard a part of it yesterday. I have gone over carefully the modification submitted by the junior Senator from Connecticut, and it seems to me that it is all we can expect in connection with those serving in the armed forces within the United States. I have talked to my colleague, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and other Members who are interested in the proposed legislation, and we have agreed to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

I wish to take this opportunity of thanking both Senators from Connecticut for the colloquy they indulged in yesterday in which they brought out the features of the Danaher amendment in such a way as to give Senators on this side the opportunity to go along with the amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield once more?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. In due course and at an appropriate time when the question comes up on my amendment I shall ask for the yeas and nays on it.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall support that request.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, several days, precious days, have been consumed in the debate over the matter of facilitating the vote of our soldiers in the coming general election. It would seem that every phase of this subject has been thoroughly explored, and that nothing could be added to the argument. I shall take only a brief portion of the Senate's time to discuss an angle which it seems to me has been neglected.

I shall address my remarks to the Danaher amendment, which has been accepted by the authors of the bill. I expect to support the Danaher amendment. I hope that before the bill is put in final form it may be strengthened even more, so that any substance of unconstitutionality may be eliminated.

There is only one standard by which we can judge this issue. That standard is what is best for America. On that test, the rights of every soldier, the privileges of every American citizen, the sound judgment of Senators will be resolved; and if we can determine what is best for America in this matter, the decision can be speedily made.

This is truly a battle for ballots—ballots for the soldiers; but the contest is not one on whether the American soldier shall have a right to vote. No one in this body has disputed that right. It is true a great deal of energy has been wasted by the emotionalists, radio commentators, feature writers, and even by men in high official positions, to make the people of the country believe that this Congress is denying the right of the soldier to vote. There is no debate on that subject. The contest is, however, whether we shall supply a 100-percent American ballot prepared in the American form, and voted in the American way by the finest group of men in all the world—our soldiers and sailors. Nor, on the other hand, shall the soldiers' right to vote be limited to a mere fraction of a ballot scattered broadside throughout the armed forces, at home and abroad, gathered under military discipline, and sent back to his home community, and with the rights of the soldier thus limited to a vote for a small fraction of the officials standing for election in November. In brief, shall he have an honest-to-goodness American ballot, bearing the names not only of the officials of the Federal Government, but also of those who regulate the things which are close to the soldier in his every day life, and which have a vital part in his home and business interests.

Shall he participate in an orderly election or in a mere galloping poll? The question may be stated in a mathematical comparison: Shall 90 percent of our soldiers have a 100-percent ballot, or

shall perhaps 95 percent of them have a 15-percent ballot? Mr. President, which group do you think would be charged with fraud by our American soldiers: those who were intent upon giving them their full rights as American soldiers and citizens, or those who want to limit that right to the voting for four offices; the candidates for which the soldiers may not even know?

But there is more to this question than the mere right of the soldier to vote. The issue lies deeper; it goes further back, and affects the very foundation of our free Government. This is not only a battle of ballots, but it is a battle for freedom which the American people have built through sacrifice, toil, sweat, and blood. Therefore, we must face this problem loyally, patriotically, and uninfluenced by rancor or partisan prejudices.

When those who established this Government set up the Constitution, they were so close to the tyrannies of Europe and the tyrannies of other parts of the world that every safeguard they could think of was placed in that compact to protect the right of free citizens from aggressions of governments, domestic as well as foreign. It was conceived by those men that a free government can continue only so long as the freedom of the individual citizens at home are preserved. They delegated to the States the power to control elections, or rather they retained it in the States for our Government was made up of a group of States, cautious of giving over certain powers to the Federal Government. So anxious were they to preserve the principle that the freedom of the individual depended upon his right to control the affairs of his own community and his own State, that every possible safeguard to that end was put into the Constitution. They were fearful that, some day, designing men might arise, whether in peace or in war, that they pointed out emphatically the dangers which would come from a highly centralized form of Government.

The junior Senator from Illinois, in that eloquent address which compares favorably with any other ever given on the floor of the Senate, quoted the words of Benjamin Franklin, who said on the morning following the completion of our Constitution:

I believe this to be a good form of government, and it will be administered well for a period of years, but it, too, will end in despotism, as every other government has ended before it, when the people become so corrupted they are incapable of any other form of government.

Down through all the years that warning has been repeatedly given.

I quote now the words of a man who, when he was Governor of our most powerful State, said, in 1930:

Now, to bring about government by oligarchy, masquerading as democracy, it is fundamentally essential that practically all authority and control be centralized in our National Government. The individual sovereignty of our States must first be destroyed, except in mere minor matters of legislation. We are safe from the dangers of any such departure from the principles on which this country was founded just so long

as the individual home rule of the States is scrupulously preserved, and fought for whenever that seems in danger.

Thus it will be seen that this home rule is a most important thing, a most vital thing, if we are to continue along the course on which we have so far progressed with such unprecedented success.

That quotation, Mr. President, is from the lips of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who now occupies the position of President of the United States. I trust he was sincere when he made that statement. But a strange philosophy has been growing up in our Government since those words were spoken. In 1935 this same Franklin D. Roosevelt had so far slipped from the moorings of constitutional government that he stated in a letter to a Member of Congress, "I hope your committee will not permit doubts as to constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the suggested legislation."

In 1937 he said in a public address that the Constitution had become too difficult to amend, and therefore he urged the enlargement of the Supreme Court so that its decisions might be made in accordance with the policies of the administration.

All through these 11 years we have seen the progressive encroachment of the Federal Government—not only upon the functions of the States but upon the duties of the Congress and the rights of free American citizens.

Today we are faced with the question: Are the laws of this Nation to be developed by the people, speaking through their chosen representatives, or are they to be made by the President, through orders administered by more than 3,000,000 paid officeholders? How far shall the hand of the Federal Government reach down and take over the functions, duties, and rights of the people in administering the most solemn obligation which comes to every citizen, that of protecting the ballot? I say the question before us is, What is best for America? Shall we go along with this encroachment of the Federal Government upon the rights of the individual citizen, or shall we hold up our hand and say, "thus far and no farther"?

Mr. President, I cannot add to the information which has already been given upon the constitutional problem involved in this issue. My life has been lived among the substantial common people of America who love their home communities, who build their businesses and give opportunities of employment to their fellow citizens in their home communities, and who look upon the duty of casting a ballot as a sacred and patriotic responsibility of citizenship. This opportunity must not be denied. Therefore, giving a full ballot to the members of our armed forces, whether in training, in transit, or fighting on the foreign front, is not only discharging a debt to them but also is protecting foundations of our Government.

I am impressed with other dangers which will attend the use of the Federal so-called ballot. The right to vote carries with it an accompanying responsibility. The voter must ask for a ballot and must vote in secret his own con-

scientious convictions as to what is good for our country. I know that the sponsors of the Federal ballot have denied that any pressure of any kind will be brought to bear upon these soldiers. I remind the Senate that for 155 years elections have been a civilian function. Today if we permit the use of the Federal ballot, we shall cross over the dividing line between civil functions and military functions. The military aspect will follow that ballot until it is marked, sealed, and delivered. The military influence of a government at war will bear weight upon that ballot. I talked with soldiers during the recent recess, and they said, "When we vote, we want to know that the heavy hand of authority is not on the pencil." That is the fear of the soldiers with regard to military elections.

The other day the President of our civil Government, in his role of Commander in Chief of the armed forces, forgot the proper relations which should exist between these functions and, presuming to speak for the armed forces, rebuked the Congress of the United States and charged it with perpetrating a fraud upon our soldiers. That act has been repudiated by every Member of this body. What a pity it was that the President took this course when we are seeking confidence and unity in America. No one can estimate the harm that message created in our land. Not only did he present that message to the Congress, but the powerful O. W. I., an agency of the executive department, sent the message with that vicious charge to the Associated Press, the United Press, and Reuters news agency abroad. It was translated into 10 different languages and sent throughout the world. It was broadcast to the Army over 60 radio stations.

That is the character of the propaganda which the executive department is now using to feed the minds of the soldiers and their families against the Congress of the United States. Is there any reason to doubt that the tons of literature, Roosevelt pictures, and buttons which are being sent out by the publicity officers of the Government will be continued through the election campaign if the Commander in Chief is renominated for a fourth term? Does anyone believe that the soldier will be able to perform his responsibility of casting an unbiased and unprejudiced vote in the coming election if the Commander in Chief is renominated for a fourth term?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). The time of the Senator from Indiana on the amendment has expired.

Mr. WILLIS. I will speak further on the bill.

Mr. President, I have been interested in analyzing the expressions which have come to my office on the soldiers' vote. Very few come from soldiers. Some come from well-meaning persons who apparently are not acquainted with the real issue; but I find that more than 75 percent of this propaganda comes from pressure groups who are interested, first of all, in maintaining the President in power for a fourth term. They do not

represent the sober thought of the citizens of our country.

The strongest criticism of the State method of voting is that it cannot be done. It can be carried out within the time limits available, without a disturbing effect upon our war effort. The figures cited by the War Department are so curious that one doubts whether the Department has given any thorough study to the question. It has said that it cannot be done, and quickly dismissed it.

I should like to cite the problem in my own State, in which lies the center of population of the United States. I have here a plan which has been formulated by the Governor of the State of Indiana in which he shows plainly that it is not only feasible, but practical to vote by absentee ballot and that it can be done with less disturbance of transportation than would be the case with the Federal ballot.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Governor of Indiana be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., December 31, 1943.

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on
Privileges and Elections,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Answering your telegram of December 31, I am pleased to advise that I have definitely decided to call a special session of our general assembly early in the new year to consider legislation relative to absentee voting for our men and women in the armed services.

I feel that I can assure you that the people of Indiana are almost unanimous in their support of any needed changes in our election laws that will make this possible.

I have given considerable thought to the several bills on this subject now before Congress, and I make bold to suggest that a much simpler plan should be adopted. Since the Constitution delegates to the States the responsibility of setting up the election machinery, I feel that it would be dangerous and unnecessary to abridge this right even in times of war.

To make possible the right of suffrage for those in the armed services, we will need the fullest cooperation between the Federal and State Governments, and to this end I should like to make the following simple suggestion:

1. Let the Congress provide for the distribution of application cards to every man and woman in the armed service. This should be done as early as possible in the coming year.

2. These cards should be addressed to the secretary of state of the State in which the soldier claims residence and on the reverse side should carry the application for ballots and the recital of a few pertinent facts concerning the voter's qualification.

3. The voter should be required to sign this application in the presence of a commissioned officer, and the card should also give the post-office address to which the ballot should be mailed.

4. Upon the arrival of these cards at the office of the secretary of state they would be forwarded to the home counties of the applicant, and the local election board could determine the eligibility of the voter, and also the precinct where his vote should be registered.

5. Every State now having a registration law could easily adopt an amendment which

would recognize the application card in lieu of the existing registration requirements.

6. Under this plan our State could forward the Federal, State, and local ballots to every applicant, and he could participate in the entire election.

7. The ballots should be returned in a suitable envelope, addressed to the election clerk in the home county of the applicant, and on the reverse side should carry the signature of the voter properly attested by a commissioned officer in the armed forces.

Under this plan the Federal Government would be obliged only to furnish and distribute the application cards to those in the armed services, wherever they may be, and thus would avoid the complications and cost of the present plans now before the Congress.

I think you will agree that it would be next to impossible for the State to undertake such a distribution or to make much headway in trying to locate these absentee voters. If these cards could be returned to the States on or before August 1, I am of the opinion that most of these men and women would have an opportunity to participate in the election. We would have 3 full months in which to mail the ballots to the voters and to receive them in the home counties in time for the election.

We would feel very greatly honored if your committee would give thoughtful consideration to this rather simple plan. We know that it would work admirably in Indiana, and I am persuaded that it could be made effective in all of the States of the Union. Under this arrangement the soldier would be voting under the same conditions and same laws that pertain to all other voters of his State.

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY F. SCHRICKEER,
Governor.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, if the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States really wants the soldiers to vote the complete ballot, it can be done. It is not necessary to go into the wasteful use of transportation in this country. It is not necessary to say that persons in high official positions, and some not in official positions, are riding through the world in special planes. I am firmly convinced that if there is a real desire on the part of the Government to give the soldiers a 100-percent ballot and have it properly cast and properly counted, it can be done.

Others have cited the dangers attendant upon the use of the Federal ballot. In this time when there is so much unrest in our country, when the people are so troubled, when they are harassed by so many difficulties, we should take no chances by enacting a law which is of doubtful constitutionality and which may be the cause of election contests. Least of all should we jeopardize the election of the President of the United States.

There is only one safe rule of conduct, and that is to do the right thing. In this instance the right thing is to operate scrupulously under the Constitution of the United States, give a full ballot to the soldiers of our country, and lend every possible facility of our Government to the transportation and proper handling of that ballot.

Mr. President, an unwarranted accusation has been made against the Senate by an entirely separate branch of our Government seeking to exert pressure on us. I plead with Senators not to permit any partisan bias or human rancor against an individual to embitter their decision as to the rights of our fighting

men abroad. Let it not cool their ardor to provide a vote for the man who wishes it, by constitutional methods. I charge Senators to provide by every possible means for the Government to expedite the lawful ballots prepared by the States. I renounce, and charge my colleagues to renounce, the petty platitudes and the organized pressure which would bring about an illegal ballot that could be twisted by politicians in high places.

Mr. President, I add my approval of the Danaher amendment because it provides all the means for voting by State ballot in those States which desire to cooperate. As I have already stated, I hope that this method can be strengthened still further so that every soldier abroad, every one of the brave men who are fighting for us, may have an equal privilege with their families at home to vote a strictly honest American ballot.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, in less than 10 months the people of the United States will select a President and a Vice President. They will elect a new House of Representatives, and 32 United States Senators. The new Government will face the continuing issues of war and peace. It will face the task of world reconstruction. It will face the problems of reconversion and rehabilitation. These are the gravest responsibilities committed to the National Government since the early days of the Republic. The Government that will confront these issues and assume these responsibilities must be the choice of all the people, including—above all—the men and women who are actually fighting this war.

When the election is held in November, 11,000,000 American citizens will be members of the armed forces. More than 5,000,000 will be overseas. Most of them will be qualified voters under the laws of their respective States and under the United States Constitution. But most of them will be unable to exercise their right to vote—even for Federal officials—unless the revised Green-Lucas bill, now under consideration in the Senate, is promptly enacted into law, and without crippling amendments. In my considered judgment, failure to enact this bill would be a harder blow than any that our enemies could strike against the morale of our armed forces and the stability of the institutions they are fighting to defend. Taxation without representation is a milder abuse than the virtual disfranchisement of the citizen-soldiers who are offering their lives for the Nation, and upon whom the survival of the Nation depends.

As a United States Senator and a representative of the people of New York—including more than a million members of the armed forces—I view with the gravest apprehension the efforts that have been made to block and emasculate the compromise Green-Lucas bill.

This legislation embodies the largest deference to State authority that is compatible with soldier voting. The various State absentee ballot laws can and should be improved, but it has become amply clear that State procedures alone cannot afford servicemen an adequate opportunity to vote. The practical difficulties involved in attempting to transport the

various ballots of 48 States to each of our soldiers, sailors, and marines in the far-flung corners of the world, and to return these ballots in time, are insuperable. The Secretary of War has stated:

No procedure offering the vote to servicemen can be effectively administered by the War and Navy Departments in time of war unless it is uniform and as simple as possible. An army engaged in waging war cannot accommodate that primary function to multiple differences in the requirements of the 48 States as to voting procedure.

The Green-Lucas bill provides the simple uniform procedure which is essential if our service men and women are really to receive their ballots for all-important national officers, express their will, and have their ballots counted by the several States in the 1944 elections.

I have carefully examined the provisions of the Green-Lucas bill to determine for myself whether there is any real basis for the constitutional issue which has been raised. It is my considered opinion, in the light of my background as a lawyer and my service on the bench, that there is no real basis for doubt as to the constitutionality of this legislation. The bill does not affect the qualifications of voters; it undertakes merely to provide an adequate machinery so that members of the armed forces may cast their ballots for the election of Federal officers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator talks about giving the soldiers the right to vote for Federal officers. Does not the Senator, as a friend of the soldiers, think we should give them the right to vote for State officers at the same time?

Mr. WAGNER. I think the Green-Lucas bill does that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. It gives the vote for Federal officers priority. The Senator ought to read the Green-Lucas bill.

Mr. WAGNER. I have read it very carefully.

Mr. President, the Congress of the United States declared war, put these men and women into uniform, and sent them to camps and stations throughout our country and the world. It cannot reasonably be argued that Congress is without power to assure them the opportunity to vote if they are otherwise qualified. The waiver of registration requirements and the waiver of payment of poll taxes, are not really in issue, because they have been law since 1942, when Public Law 712 was passed with few dissenting votes.

An analogous statute, the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act was passed without any serious challenge even though it permits the stay of actions in State courts against soldiers and sailors until the completion of military service and bans mortgage foreclosures.

Mr. President, the people of New York are not divided on this basic issue. They have not reserved their judgment until they can discover how the servicemen will vote if they are given the opportunity. They do not claim a vested interest in ineffective voting procedure. They

are not interested in legal technicalities. Regardless of party, they wish the men and women of the services to have the best opportunity to vote that can possibly be accorded them by law. I voice their united sentiment in urging the passage of the Green-Lucas bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion for a moment?

Mr. LANGER. I withhold it.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the pending question is on the amendment as modified, which I offered, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the pending question.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut demands the yeas and nays. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gerry	Overton
Andrews	Gillette	Pepper
Austin	Green	Radcliffe
Bailey	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barkley	Hawkes	Robertson
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Smith
Bridges	Jackson	Stewart
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Buck	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lodge	Tobey
Byrd	Lucas	Truman
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Mead	Walsh, N. J.
DanaHER	Millikin	Wheeler
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Downey	Murdock	White
Eastland	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Nye	Willis
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willson
George	O'Mahoney	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, as modified. On that question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that some of the Members of the Senate have necessarily been detained on other business, I ask that the amendment as modified be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment as modified.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, beginning with line 5, it is proposed to strike out all of subsection (a) of section 4, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

(a) The provisions of this title shall apply with respect to the following:

1. Members of the armed forces and the merchant marine of the United States, outside the United States.

(2) Persons serving with the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, and the United States Service Organizations, outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States.

(3) Members of the armed forces who are inside the United States who are residents of any State of which the secretary of state has not certified to the Commission prior to August 1, 1944, that the State has made provision for such members to vote by absentee ballot and that the State will accept post-card applications as provided for in title II of this act; and the Commission shall promptly advise the Secretaries of War and Navy of the names of the States which have so certified. Any such member of the armed forces who is inside the United States and who has not received his State ballot may vote under the provisions of this title, provided such member shall execute the oath hereinafter set forth.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in view of the further consideration which has been given the amendment, and the explanation hitherto offered, and in view of the statement by the Senator from Illinois of his complete agreement to accept the amendment as modified, I shall not further take the time of the Senate. Unless there be questions to be propounded, I yield the floor.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I do not rise to make a speech, but as chairman of the committee which reported the bill to the Senate I wish to say that the amendment meets with the approval of the committee. I congratulate those who are responsible for what we might call the great Connecticut compromise. It is an example of bipartisan, patriotic cooperation which is very encouraging in these days.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I have listened intently to the arguments by various Senators who have expressed their views as to the method that should be provided to enable the men and women in our armed forces to vote. I have talked with hundreds of private citizens, and many in the armed forces, and they continually say to me that the soldier should have the right to vote, but that no one should have the right to vote him.

I am definitely and positively in favor of the soldier voting, and it is my firm conviction that he can vote within the bounds of the constitutional authorizations of the Nation and the State, if enough of us are determined to find a way. I believe there are suggestions before the Senate now which solve all of the problems.

I am in favor of the DanaHER amendment, which would have the Federal ballot used only in those cases where the States themselves had not provided practical ways and means for a soldier to vote. In my own State of New Jersey Gov. Walter E. Edge, former United States Senator for 10 years and former Ambassador to France, assures me that the State of New Jersey will provide ways and means which will make it possible for its citizens in the armed forces to have the full right of suffrage.

I repeat from his inaugural address the following:

One of the most glaring and indefensible omissions of the Federal Government and to

some extent the State governments has been failure to provide workable methods for voting by members of our armed forces both at home and abroad. Personally, I feel it is chiefly an obligation of the States with the necessary cooperation of the Federal Government to the extent that ballots will be delivered, collected, and returned. With approximately 400,000 New Jersey men and women of voting age practically disenfranchised, a situation is presented that demands immediate action and no excuses can be tolerated.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution which has been passed today by the New Jersey Legislature, and I ask that it be read by the clerk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 2

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation, expeditiously, which will leave to the States the responsibility of providing the form of absentee ballots and all provisions for tabulation of the vote and which will provide for Federal action only in the delivery, collection and return of the ballots

Whereas Congress is considering soldier vote legislation; and

Whereas the Constitution of the State of New Jersey provides that no elector in the actual military service of the United States shall be deprived of his vote by reason of his absence from his election district, and places the duty upon our legislature to provide by law for the effectuation of this guaranty; and

Whereas the New Jersey Legislature is now in session and desires to make all further changes in our laws which will improve the opportunity of our servicemen and servicewomen to vote; and

Whereas New Jersey servicemen and servicewomen will be assured of their right to vote for all Federal, State and county candidates and also on public questions if Congress will provide merely for full and speedy cooperation in the delivering, collecting and returning of the ballots; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby urged to adopt legislation, expeditiously, which will leave to the States the responsibility of providing the form of absentee ballots and all provisions for tabulation of the vote and which will provide the Federal action only in the delivery, collection and return of the ballots.

2. That the secretary of state be and is hereby directed to transmit, immediately following the passage of this joint resolution, a copy thereof, properly authenticated, to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey.

3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately.

Approved January 25, 1944.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution presented by the Senator from New Jersey will lie on the table.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I regret that anyone in high office has seen fit to impute fraud to those who differ as to the importance of preserving to the States the functions which belong to them as individual entities of a national whole. This is a time when we need unity and cooperation to win the war and establish and preserve a sound

peace. Charges of fraud do not contribute to cooperation and unity.

I have not talked with a single soldier, or anyone else serving in the war effort, who does not admit that he wishes to vote for an individual and not for a party. He wishes his vote to be in extreme secrecy, as at home. He wishes the right to cast an intelligent vote, based not only upon knowledge of the person he is voting for, but some of the principles for which that individual stands. He wishes to vote for all representatives within his right to vote.

We are fighting this war to preserve the right to have and express a difference of opinion, and let us hope that right will be preserved in harmony.

If the administration of this Government wishes the soldier to have the right to vote in secrecy and with understanding, there is no reason why the Office of War Information should not function honestly with representatives from both the major political parties, and get as much information as possible from both sides regarding the candidates and issues to the soldiers, wherever they may be. Certainly it is more important for the soldiers to vote intelligently than it is to send many people around the world by airplane on questionable expeditions, or even to send volumes of literature which, even though interesting, do not have a vital bearing upon the future destiny of this country. The ballot does have a vital bearing on the future of this country.

I have disapproved of many things done by the O. W. I., but inasmuch as we have that going agency of Government and it is continuing to function, regardless of this soldier vote issue, it is my firm conviction that it should be used as an agency of the American people to make a full contribution to an honest, intelligent election in which the soldier is enabled to exercise his right to vote through receiving equal and truthful information with regard to the candidates of both parties. I recommend that the chairmen of the national committees of all major political parties make recommendations to the President which will assist in carrying this plan into effect.

I hope most of our American people still recognize that the preservation of the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the States themselves is vital to the future welfare of our people. I hope we will all be wise enough to understand now that if we give the soldier the right to vote without the privilege of voting in secrecy, and without the information to enable him to register his vote intelligently and effectively as he wills to do, then every man in this great Congress and every officer in the States may see the day when the soldier returns and finds demoralized conditions which are contrary to his hope and desire—yes, contrary to what he expected. Let us not force him to blame us for a condition which would be the result of his voting without information, rather than enabling him to vote in the constitutionally authorized way after receiving all the information it is possible for us to send to him under the difficult conditions of global war.

I am in favor of giving those in the armed forces this full right, and I believe if the administration, the Congress, and the Army and Navy do their full duty, they will get that right. Certainly no one will deny that I am as deeply interested in the right of those in the armed forces to vote as anyone could be. Mrs. Hawkes and I have given to this war, through death in the far-off southwest Pacific, our only son, who has left a wife and two children, and I defy anyone to say that I am not as deeply interested in the welfare of the soldiers and all in the services as any other Member of this body, or as the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I wish to leave this thought with the Senate: In one of the last letters I received from my boy, when we had asked him what he wanted for Christmas, he replied, "I should like to have true information of what is going on back home in the United States." Mr. President, do not forget that every soldier in uniform wants such true information, and that the right to vote without information, without secrecy, is not worth the paper it is written on.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, before we proceed to vote I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut for information on the pending amendment. Will the Senator from Connecticut please turn to section 202 of the pending bill. It will be found on page 43, in title II, and is as follows:

SEC. 202. Such post cards (and post cards provided under section 3 of this act prior to its amendment) may be used, if State law permits, as applications for ballots under State absentee balloting laws, as applications for registration under State absentee balloting laws, or as sources of information to implement State absentee balloting laws. No voter shall be precluded from voting under the provisions of title I of this act by reason of any post-card application made under this title, unless such voter casts an absentee ballot.

It is my understanding that as proposed to be amended the provisions of the Green-Lucas measure will apply to these classes of cases: Individuals in the service and others affected by the bill who are outside the continental United States and individuals within the continental United States from States whose laws do not conform to section 202. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. DANAHER. I assume the Senator is referring in his question simply to title II of the bill?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. If the Senator's State of West Virginia will not receive the Federal post-card form which is provided for on page 42 of the bill, then clearly section 202 of title II will not apply to an absentee from the State of West Virginia, and consequently if the State of West Virginia will not accept that application form as an application for a ballot, if it will not accept it as an application for registration, there is only one other possible use the State of West Virginia might make of it, and that is, as the language itself states, as a source of information to implement such absentee balloting laws.

If the State of West Virginia will not permit an absentee to vote or to qualify

to vote under title II through a State ballot by use of the uniform post card which is provided for on page 42, then title I applies, and consequently absentees from the State of West Virginia who desire to vote in November 1944 in West Virginia may vote only for Federal officers, and then only in accordance with the uniform Federal ballot form provided in title I. When I use the word "only," I emphasize it; I mean only insofar as the Lucas-Green bill, as it may be amended, is concerned. Naturally, if the State of West Virginia is able to get those ballots into the hands of its absentees, whether they be in Madagascar or India, or whether they be in a camp in the United States, then lines 5, 6, and 7 on page 42 apply. They read:

Where State procedures can be effectively employed, to members of the armed forces located in other places.

Thus such absentees would be relegated to use of the State ballot in accordance with the laws of the State of West Virginia. I do not know what are the laws of the State of West Virginia, but if they cover points such as those I have mentioned, or omit to make mention in the particulars to which I have referred, then my answer, I think, will be found to apply.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I feel that the statement of the Senator is quite clear. I make the inquiry not only for the soldiers, sailors, and marines who have gone forth from the State of West Virginia, but I call the matter to the attention of the Members of this body so that they may vote intelligently upon the question.

On January 3, 1944, the Legislature of West Virginia was called into extra session, and proceeded at once to enact a statute to enable the soldiers, sailors, and marines from that State in the armed services to vote. We, of West Virginia, regardless of party—and I may say that the legislature and the Governor of my State are members of the opposite party from mine—have considered that law to be a very liberal one. That law is very direct; it is very certain. It enables the men from our State, wherever in the world they may be, to vote. But in our State we require registration. However, under the permanent registration laws of West Virginia a man is required to register only once every 5 years. But to the boys who had gone into the armed services before they were 21, and subsequently became 21 years of age, we gave the opportunity of filing a form which is fixed by the statute. I do not know how many other States have enacted similar statutes. I know that the State of Illinois has enacted a statute. I do not know how those men are to be registered. I know that the State of Georgia has enacted a somewhat similar statute.

But if the amendment of the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] is adopted, then the effect of this law of West Virginia will be absolutely destroyed, insofar as it would permit our men to vote. Mr. President, I should not say "permit our men to vote"; they still could vote their State ballot, but they would come under the provisions of Green-Lucas bill, despite

the fact that West Virginia has enacted this new statute.

I make this inquiry solely for the purpose of bringing the matter to the attention of other Senators from other States, who may be in a similar situation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for a question?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I understand that the Senator's amendment, as modified, deals with the Federal ballot.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. And that the Federal ballot will be available to members of the armed forces overseas, and also the ballot under the State laws?

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. And that the Federal ballot will be available to a citizen of, let us say, the State of Ohio, even if Ohio has a workable absentee-voting law, if the soldier certifies that he is unable to receive a State absentee-voting ballot.

Mr. DANAHER. If he certifies under oath.

Mr. BURTON. Yes; under oath.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I like the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER]; he is an able Senator and a fine man. I have tried to find some way to be able to vote for the amendment he has offered. But as I read the amendment—and if I am wrong about it I hope the Senator will correct me—I find that it provides that in the case of a State which has not certified to the Commission prior to August 1, 1944, that it, the State, has made provision for such members of the armed forces to vote by absentee ballot, then the commission will step in and will furnish the rules for balloting; and it is under those rules that the soldiers from the States which have not certified that they have provided for State absentee balloting, will vote. Is that correct?

Mr. DANAHER. That is my understanding.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in my judgment, according to the decisions of the Supreme Court, some of which I read yesterday, such a provision would be absolutely unconstitutional. I do not think Congress has any more right or power under the Constitution to control the voting in this country than it has to provide for the succession to the throne in the Kingdom of Great Britain, or to say who will be the next dictator in Russia or who is to succeed Hitler in Germany, or any similar proposition. I think Congress is wholly without power, under the opinions of the Supreme Court, to pass election laws for the people of this country to vote for Presidential electors. For that reason, I shall vote against the Danaher amendment.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet I desire to say something about the general situation. What I shall say will be very short. I have found, after careful

consideration, that I cannot vote for the Green-Lucas bill as recommended by the committee. I desire to point out very briefly why I cannot support it. At the outset I desire to say that no one is more desirous of having every United States soldier, sailor, and marine vote in the November elections than am I. I wish to point out, further, that I have been in this body and in the body at the other end of the Capitol for a period of approximately 32 years. During all that time we have had many votes on what are known as soldiers' bills. I never in my life have voted against a soldiers' bill. I think those who go on the field of battle and offer their lives in the defense of their country should be treated with the greatest liberality and the greatest consideration. I have always taken that position, and I am taking that position now. I want the soldier to have the right and the opportunity to vote for any candidate of his own choosing in the election, whether it be a Presidential elector, a Senator, a Member of the House of Representatives, a Governor, a member of the State legislature, a State judge, a county officer, or a city official. The bill would not preserve any such rights to the members of our armed forces. The pending Green-Lucas bill would, by the use of the word "priorities," virtually limit them to voting for Presidential electors, Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives. The bill itself provides that votes for Presidential electors, Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives shall be placed in one class, and that votes for State officials are to be placed in another class. I do not believe in giving the soldiers such an unjust and unfair privilege of voting, even if we had authority to do so. I am discussing the merits of the bill; I am not now discussing constitutional questions. For heaven's sake, Mr. President, if we are going to give our soldiers who are fighting for us on the fields of battle the privilege of voting, as we claim we are going to do, let us give them the full and complete privilege of voting, not merely throw a sop to them, and tell them, "You can vote for Presidential electors, Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives," and then say, as the bill as it is worded does say, "We do not care so much about candidates for local and State offices. Anything we can do to help you along, we will be very glad to do; but we will not bother too much about that. We are interested in your voting for Presidential electors and for Members of the House of Representatives and for Senators."

Mr. President, I do not want to vote for that sort of a soldiers' voting bill, and I shall not do so.

The first class is to be treated differently by the War and Navy Departments, and Federal officials are to be preferred. This limitation is placed upon the soldier by reason of public statements by the War and Navy Departments to the effect that they have neither the steamer facilities nor the airplane space to carry the ballots to the soldiers and bring them back. The departments are willing to carry them and bring them back if the soldiers vote for Presidential electors,

Representatives, and Senators, but if they vote for Governors and other State officers on the same ticket, the ballot becomes too heavy. There is too much freight. The departments cannot carry it. It is too great a burden on their air services. It is too great a burden on their steamer services. Fiddlesticks! I am told that more than 300,000 tons—perhaps it was 3,000,000 tons—of Christmas presents were sent to the soldiers a little more than a month ago. There was no trouble about that. But if we ask for facilities to carry 30,000 or 40,000 pounds of ballots to allow the servicemen to vote for their friends in their own counties or States, the departments say, "Oh, no; we cannot take it. It is too great a burden on the Army. It is too great a burden on shipping. It is too great a burden on the air facilities."

Mr. President, I do not believe in treating the soldiers in any such way. I believe that the soldiers should be allowed to aid, by their votes, in the election of State, county, and city officials, as well as Federal officials. I am not willing to vote for a measure which would limit the opportunity or privilege of the soldier to voting only for Federal officials.

To my mind it would be wholly unfair to the servicemen in foreign lands or foreign waters to be told that they may vote for Presidential electors or for Senators or Representatives, but that they may not vote for officers in their own States. Suppose the mother of a soldier in Italy were running for county-court clerk in Davidson County, Tenn. If the Green-Lucas bill were to be enacted into law, do Senators have any idea that that boy would ever be able to vote for his mother? There is not one chance in 50 that the vote would ever be counted. It would never get back here. It would be too late. There is no provision in the bill for expediting the transmission of such ballots. Why should the soldier be deprived of the right and privilege of voting for his own mother, who may be popular in his home county? Suppose the soldier's father were running for Governor of Tennessee. Why should he not have the right and privilege of voting for his father, his uncle, or any other person in that State? If he has a dear friend running for sheriff of any county in my State, or any other State, why should he not have the right and privilege of voting for him?

The proponents of the bill are very careful about voting for Senators and Representatives, and electors for President and Vice President; but State and local officers are stepchildren under the Green-Lucas bill. Why should the soldier be denied the right and privilege, as this bill would deny him the right and privilege, to vote for his friends in his own State, and be permitted to vote only for Federal officers? This measure is called a Federal ballot bill. The whole thing is looked at through Federal eyes. It is not a soldiers' voting bill, but it is a soldiers' Federal voting bill. Under the bill soldiers would be permitted to vote for Federal officers. We propose to say to the soldiers, "We will help you if we can; we will expedite the balloting for

State officers if we can, but we will give the Federal ballots priority."

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hold in my hand a letter addressed to me by a colonel in the United States Army stationed at Guadalcanal. I received it yesterday, 7 days after it was mailed. It is postmarked Guadalcanal, January 25, 1944. It required 7 days to reach me in my office from a soldier in the Army at Guadalcanal.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy have publicly stated that they have not the space in their steamers and aircraft to carry State ballots to the soldiers and return them, because such large ballots would require too much space. That difficulty could be easily overcome by printing the ballots on thinner, lighter paper, and by making the printing thereon smaller. The mechanical part of it could easily be arranged, and there would be no trouble about it.

Mr. President, it cannot be said that I take this position because of the fact that there is a poll tax requirement in my State. We have such a law. I am not wedded to it, and never have been. I made a mistake when I voted for the soldiers' voting bill which was passed in 1942. I voted for it without careful examination. I believe that I voted for an unconstitutional measure. That bill had a provision abolishing certain poll tax requirements in the States. I do not believe that that law is valid, but to show my good faith so far as the poll tax was concerned, I voted for the bill. I voted erroneously. I should like to see the law removed from the statute books, because it might as well not be there. In my judgment it is unconstitutional.

I am perfectly content to have the soldiers vote without reference to registration, because they are registered in the Army in the cause of their country, and such a change in the State laws would be justified. I would go even further and allow all the boys, regardless of their age, to vote, if it could be done constitutionally. If a boy is old enough to carry a gun on the field of battle for his country, he is old enough to cast a vote. So I am sorry that I cannot vote for an amendment which I understand will be offered in that connection. I want them all to vote fully and freely.

I now come to the constitutional question. I am opposed to this bill, Mr. President, because it is clearly in plain violation of the terms of the Federal Constitution. As we all know, the President and Vice President of the United States are chosen by electors. The electors are chosen under State law. The candidate receiving the majority of the votes of the electoral college is elected President. The manner of choosing electors is set forth in article II of the Federal Constitution. I invite it to the attention of

Senators. This is our Constitution, under which we sit here.

Each State—

Not this Congress; not the Federal Government, but each State—

shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress.

Section 2 of article I of the Constitution provides as follows:

The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

In other words, Mr. President, the Constitution expressly and specifically provides that the elections for President and Vice President shall be held in such manner as the legislatures of the various States may direct. It nowhere gives to the Congress the right to hold such elections for any purpose or under any circumstances. The only power which the Congress has under the Constitution is to "determine the time of choosing the electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes; which day shall be the same throughout the United States."

Mr. President, those are the plain provisions of our Constitution. Those provisions have been followed in this country for 155 years; and during all that time the voting for electors to choose the President and Vice President of the United States has been under the absolute control of the States. But the suggestion is made that we are now engaged in a war, and that these constitutional provisions are not effective in time of war. Mr. President, we have had six great wars in our history, five of them under the Constitution; and yet our voting has never been taken over by the Federal Government under any excuse. The States have always been held to have complete control of elections. So far as I have been able to ascertain this is the first time in the history of our Nation that it has ever been suggested that the express provisions of our Federal Constitution giving to the States control of Federal elections be nullified because our Nation is at war.

Mr. President, I ask Senators to listen to me while I refer to the crucial feature of the whole situation which confronts us. I ask Senators to listen, because every one of them has taken an oath. All 96 of us took an oath. At the Vice President's desk the oath was administered to us by the Vice President in accordance with the Constitution, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God?

And each one of us answered, "I do." Did we not all say that?

Are we not evading the Constitution when we undertake to take over the voting powers which the Constitution expressly states are to be exclusively in the States?

What about our oath? We all respect the oath which we took. We did not take the oath as a matter of form. I think it was a solemn moment when each of us took the oath. I have taken it five times at the Vice President's desk in this Chamber. They were the most solemn five occasions of my life. I never was so deeply impressed in all my life as I was the first time I took the oath, and I was just as much impressed the last time I took it. I believe that the pending bill is right in the teeth of the express provisions of our Federal Constitution.

Mr. President, I would not be true to myself or my country if I voted for a bill which I conscientiously believed to be opposed to what are not implied but express provisions of the Constitution. For all these reasons I shall not vote for the bill.

However, it is said by some that our soldiers want us to do so. Think of that! Senators heard the arguments which were made that our soldiers want us to pass this bill, be it constitutional or not. I say to the Senate that the soldiers of Tennessee are not asking me to violate this very Constitution for which they are offering up their lives to protect and to defend. Not a single one of them has asked me to violate my oath. They are fighting for the Constitution. Why are we not willing to stand by their side and say that we will uphold that Constitution? The obligation upon us is greater, or at least as great, than upon them. They themselves took an oath to defend the Constitution, and so did we.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator on the amendment has expired.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall take time on the bill.

Mr. President, why should we go back on those boys? We are asking them to defend the Constitution in foreign lands under the greatest difficulties which can be imagined. They are offering up their lives. Thirty-two thousand of them have already given up their lives. They are doing a wonderful job on the field of battle, and they are expecting us to do the same kind of a job back home in protecting, defending, and upholding the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, I now wish to make a very brief statement concerning another matter. It was for the reasons which I have stated that I voted for a substitute to a similar bill when it was before the Senate a short time ago. That measure is now being considered in the House of Representatives.

I was deeply hurt a few days ago when it was stated to me that when I voted for that substitute I had voted an attempted fraud upon the American soldiers and upon the American people. I wish to say to the Senate that this accusation against me has no possible foundation in truth. I hardly believed my ears when I heard the statement read

here that I was seeking to perpetrate a fraud upon the American soldiers by voting for a perfectly constitutional and proper measure which would give to the soldiers, not a partial right, not a limited right, not a partial privilege, not a limited privilege, but a wholly correct right and privilege to vote for all officers who will be voted for in the election next November.

Mr. President, since I heard the statement to which I have referred made against me and others—there were 42 of us—I took the trouble to think back as far as I could, over my entire life. I do not recall ever having attempted to practice a fraud upon anyone, or ever having practiced a fraud upon anyone in my whole life. I say that with the utmost sincerity, and I believe it to be the truth. I have honestly and sincerely made it a rule in my life never to let any man do more for me than I do for him. As God is my judge, I have tried faithfully and earnestly to carry out the rule. And now, in answer to that kind of a life, I find that I am accused of attempting to practice a fraud upon the American soldier and the American people. I, who never voted against the interests of the soldiers, after my long public life, am held up to view by one of the leading men of the world as attempting to practice a fraud. I am indeed sorry that accusation was made against me and the other Members of Congress.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention, if I may, to three Members of this body who have already lost sons in the war. As I pointed out a day or two ago, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] lost a son in action, fighting for his country in north Africa. The Senator from Arkansas also has another son, about 17 years of age, who is today fighting in the Army of the United States for this very Constitution which, as God is my judge, I am trying to protect and defend, just as his boy and other boys are trying to protect it in foreign lands and on foreign waters. Think of the Senator from Arkansas, in those circumstances, being charged with attempting a fraud upon the soldiers, when two of his boys were in the ranks fighting for their country, and one of them has died in that service.

The second Senator to whom I refer, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], lost a brave, manly son, who died from disease on a South Pacific island, while he was fighting for his country. As I think the Senator said this afternoon, his boy's last postal, in answer to the question as to what he wanted for Christmas, was to the effect that he would rather have honest and reliable information of conditions back home. "That is what we are out here fighting for more than anything else." How could a man who lost his only son in our Army, fighting for his country, practice a fraud upon his boy and upon his boy's comrades?

The third Senator who has lost a son is one of the dearest friends I have ever known, one of the most distinguished Members of this body. The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] had a

son in the Air Forces, who in his plane went out to engage in combat in defense of this very Constitution, and never returned. Good heavens! Is it possible for anyone to think that the Senator from Georgia would vote for any bill which would practice a fraud upon the boys in the Army, when his son died in the performance of such valiant service?

Mr. President, I do not know how the Senator from Georgia will vote on the bill. He was attending to other duties and did not vote when the celebrated 42 Senators voted for the bill which has already passed, and is now in the House of Representatives. Thirty-seven voted against it. I do not know how the Senator from Georgia will vote now, and, so far as I am concerned, it makes no difference. I merely point out that I believe that the gentleman from Georgia, WALTER GEORGE, no matter which way he votes, will not feel that he is voting to practice a fraud upon or to hurt the best interests of boys serving in an Army of which his son was such a distinguished member. Two of these Senators, as I have said, voted for the bill which has already passed.

Ah, Mr. President, I regret more deeply than I can express in words that such a statement has been made about the action of the 42 Senators, including the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], who have actually lost sons in the war; but such a statement was made.

I am a bachelor; as all my colleagues know, I have no children. I am in some doubt whether I should say what I am about to say, but I desire to show that I have a personal interest in the boys in the Army, and I am proud to state that I have seven nephews in the service of their country in the present war, two of them fighting in the far Southwest Pacific. One of them is the captain of a machine gun company which was the first company to land on Bougainville a short time ago. Another is fighting in the Navy of the United States. I have two other nephews who are fighting in Europe. One of them fought in the north African campaign, and is now either in north Africa or Italy.

Another, stationed in England, is an air pilot. He is the captain of a heavy bomber, and has just been decorated with the Distinguished Flying Cross. He is a grand young fellow, and his good father named him for me. Senators can imagine how I love that boy. They can imagine how proud I am of him. Would any Senator think that I would be guilty of voting against the best interests of that boy, or of any of the seven? The three I have not mentioned are at their respective posts of duty, but I cannot say exactly where they are. I do know about the four to whom I have referred. I could not vote against the best interests of those boys, and when I vote, as I expect to vote, to give them the right we ourselves have in the matter of casting ballots in the coming election, I shall feel that I am but doing my duty.

The boy in England, let me add, has taken 54 trips with his heavy bomber plane hunting for Hitler in the Hitler

dominions. I could not go back on that boy, and I could not go back on his comrades.

I am for those boys, I am intensely for them, and I want the RECORD to show that I am in favor of giving the comrades of these young men who are dear to me every consideration. I would rather cut off my hand than do an injury to these boys or to their comrades.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, think of me as a Senator, in this great body of men, trying to practice a fraud on these young men of my own flesh and blood, and their comrades, whoever they may be, in the great Army of the United States.

Mr. President, I am not criticizing anyone, but with all the solemnity and kindness of which I am capable I want to say that I deeply regret that the charge has been brought against me and the other 41 Senators who voted as I did, and I think I speak the sentiment of all of them when I say that they never remotely dreamed that they were voting for anything but the best interests of the soldiers in our Army.

Mr. President, I know that my days are lengthening, but for a very long time I have endeavored, with all the strength a gracious God has given me, to uphold and defend and protect the Constitution of the United States. I have never in all my life felt that there was greater need for my voting to help protect and defend the Constitution of the United States and the system of government which is ours, than there is at this very moment. For that reason I shall vote for the substitute which will be offered by a number of Senators, which is precisely along the line of the measure for which we voted some 6 weeks or 2 months ago. I have no apologies to make for that vote. I am proud to be able to cast my vote for the unlimited right conferred by our Constitution upon the States to see to it that our boys serving their country in the armed forces shall have an unlimited right to vote for the candidates of their choice in the next election, whether it be for the humble constable in their home counties or for electors for President of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McCARRAN. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent on official business. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained in one of the Government departments. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is necessarily absent. I am advised that he would vote "yea" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—72

Alken	Gillette	Pepper
Andrews	Green	Radcliffe
Austin	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Barkley	Hatch	Shipstead
Bone	Hawkes	Stewart
Brewster	Hayden	Taft
Bridges	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Jackson	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Tobey
Bushfield	Kilgore	Truman
Butler	La Follette	Tunnell
Capper	Langer	Tydings
Chandler	Lodge	Vandenberg
Chavez	Lucas	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Maloney	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Maybank	Wheeler
Downey	Mead	Wherry
Ellender	Murdoch	White
Ferguson	Murray	Wiley
George	Nye	Willis
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wilson

NAYS—19

Bailey	Eastland	Overton
Bankhead	Hill	Revercomb
Bilbo	McClellan	Robertson
Buck	McKellar	Russell
Byrd	Millikin	Smith
Caraway	Moore	
Connally	O'Daniel	

NOT VOTING—5

Glass	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham	

So Mr. DANAHER's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, there is a technical change in the form of oath on page 31 which will be required by the amendment. I will state the amendment from my desk, in order that all Senators may be informed regarding it. We would add a new subclause in clause 5:

(d) Check appropriate items: (1) I am outside the United States—

With provision for a check mark to be noted—

(2) I am inside the United States, but have not received my State ballot—

With a provision for a check mark there to be inserted.

That form of the oath, therefore, would be integrated with the amendment just acted on by the Senate.

I offer the amendment without further statement, and ask that the Senate act upon it.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I may say that the amendment is perfectly acceptable to the Committee.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not desire to speak on the amendment, but I desire to comment for a moment on the amendment which has just been adopted. I voted for the amendment because to some extent it would cut down the scope of the Federal ballot. It is interesting, I think, that the sponsors of the bill have now accepted an amendment which contains the principle that soldiers who have a State voting law at home can be effectively served with a State ballot, and that the sponsors of the bill have accepted the principle that they shall be

entitled to a Federal ballot only if their State does not provide a State ballot.

The question now mainly before the Senate is whether by that action the sponsors of the bill have admitted that the same principle can properly be applied to the soldiers abroad. That goes merely to the question of transportation; and it seems to me obvious that, as to the question of transportation, it can be clearly shown that the State ballots can be transported and furnished to the soldiers abroad just as effectively as they can be furnished to the soldiers at home.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MAYBANK obtained the floor.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I was hopeful that we might have a voice vote on my amendment, and dispose of it at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Question.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which has been printed, and ask that it be read at the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 39, in line 11, after the word "States", it is proposed to insert the following:

And this decision shall be final to the same extent as in the case of ballots cast by others in person.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Members of the Senate will remember that yesterday I asked to have the amendment printed, and stated that I would offer it and ask to have it agreed to. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to discuss the amendment, but I ask that it be agreed to.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, let me state that the amendment would seem to effect what is the expressed intention of the bill, and I am glad to accept it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which has been printed and lies on the desk, and ask to have it stated.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator from Ohio whether he desires to have the amendment read from the desk or printed in the Record, inasmuch as it is anticipated that we shall not be in session much longer today.

Mr. TAFT. It will be acceptable to have the amendment printed in the Record. My understanding is that the Senator from Kentucky intends to move in a few minutes to have the Senate adjourn or take a recess until tomorrow, when further consideration of the pending measure will be had.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment proposed by Mr. TAFT is as follows:

Strike out all of pages 29 to 44, inclusive, and insert:

"(c) This title shall not be applicable after December 31, 1945.

"(d) This title shall not be applicable in the case of the citizens of any State which has prior to June 1, 1944, made provision for absentee-voting ballots for members of the armed forces, complying with the following conditions:

"(1) Such ballots may be used without registration, in person.

"(2) Such ballots shall be printed and available for mailing at least 45 days in advance of the election.

"(3) Such ballots, with accompanying envelopes and voting instructions, shall weigh not more than 1.2 ounces.

The Commission shall ascertain and certify to the Secretaries of War and Navy and to the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, on or before July 1, 1944, the States which have not made provision for absentee voting ballots in accordance with the conditions specified in this subsection.

"OFFICIAL WAR BALLOTS, ENVELOPES, AND EXPLANATIONS

"SEC. 5. (a) The Commission shall cause to be prepared and printed for use in voting in general elections under this title an adequate number of official war ballots. Each ballot shall be printed in the following form insofar as the offices enumerated are appropriate to the particular election:

"OFFICIAL WAR BALLOT

"Instruction: To vote, write in the name of the candidate of your choice for each office.

"ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

"(A vote for President includes a vote for Vice President of the same party)

"Write in the name of your choice for President _____

"UNITED STATES SENATOR

"(Only if a Senator is to be elected in your State)

"Write in the name of your choice for Senator _____

"REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FOR YOUR DISTRICT

"Write in the name of your choice for Representative in Congress for your district _____

"REPRESENTATIVE AT LARGE IN CONGRESS

"(Only in the States entitled thereto)

"Write in the name or names of your choice for Representative at Large _____

"(Vote for one or two as the case may be)

A vote for a Presidential candidate by name shall be deemed to be a vote for the candidates for Presidential and Vice Presidential electors of his party. No ballot shall be invalid by reason of mistake or omission in writing in the name of the candidate where the candidate intended by the voter is plainly identifiable. Where, because of any defect in marking, a ballot is held invalid as to any particular candidate for office, it shall remain valid as to the other candidates for office.

"(b) The Commission shall also cause to be prepared and printed an appropriate number of official inner envelopes for use in sealing the official war ballots. Each envelope shall be gummed ready for sealing. Upon one side of the envelope shall be printed:

"OFFICIAL WAR BALLOT FOR GENERAL ELECTION

"Name of voter-----
 "(Print your name plainly here)

"Home residence:
 "Street and number (if any) or rural route-----
 "(Print street and number or rural route plainly here)

"City or town (if any)-----
 "(Print city or town plainly here)

"County-----
 "(Print county plainly here)

"Upon the other side of such envelope shall be printed the following oath, at the top of which shall be set forth the date of the election:

"OATH OF ELECTOR FOR VOTING IN THE GENERAL ELECTIONS TO BE HELD IN 1944

"I do hereby swear (or affirm) that:

"(1) I am a citizen of the United States;

"(2) The date of my birth was-----;

"(3) For ----- years preceding this election my home residence has been in the State of -----;

"(4) For ----- years preceding this election my home residence has been in the (city, town, or village) of ----- in the county of ----- at (street and number, if any, or rural route) -----;

"(5) I am (check appropriate blank):

"(a) in the armed forces of the United States ();

"(b) in the merchant marine of the United States ();

"(c) serving with the American Red Cross (), the Society of Friends (), the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots (), or the United Service Organizations (), outside the United States, and am attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States;

and that I have not voted and do not intend to vote in this election at any address other than the above; and that I have not received or offered, do not expect to receive, have not paid, offered or promised to pay, contributed, offered, or promised to contribute to another, to be paid or used, any money or other valuable thing as a compensation or reward for the giving of a vote at this election, and have not made any promise to influence the giving or withholding of any such vote; and that I have not been convicted of bribery or any infamous crime, or, if so convicted, that I have been pardoned or restored to all the rights of a citizen, without restriction as to the rights of suffrage.

"(Voter must write his usual signature here and oath must be administered and attested.)

"Subscribed and sworn to before me this ----- day of -----, 194--

"(Commissioned, noncommissioned, or petty officer not below the rank of sergeant or its equivalent, or other person authorized to administer and attest this oath.)

"(c) The Commission shall also cause to be prepared and printed an appropriate number of official outer envelopes for use in returning to the Commission official war ballots and official inner envelopes. Upon such outer envelope the following shall be printed:

"Free of all postage including air mail

"(Official Federal War Ballot)

"To the Soldiers' and Sailors' War Ballot Commission:

"For transmission to the secretary of state of the State shown below:

"Voter's home residence:

"Street and number (if any) or rural route-----
 "(Print clearly)

"City or town-----
 "(Print clearly)

"County-----
 "(Print clearly)

"State-----
 "(Print clearly)

"(d) Ballots and envelopes for use outside the United States shall be suitable for air mailing.

"(e) The Commission shall also cause to be prepared and printed an adequate number of copies of explanations of voting procedure for use in accordance with the provisions of this title.

"(f) Where the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy determines that the transmission abroad of any material required to be prepared and printed by the provisions of this section is inexpedient because of transportation difficulties or for other reasons arising from the conduct of the war, the Commission is authorized to arrange for such material to be printed outside the United States.

"BALLOTING

"Sec. 6. (a) Any person desiring and entitled to vote under the provisions of this title may apply for an official war ballot to the Soldiers' and Sailors' War Ballot Commission, or to the Secretary of War, or to the Secretary of the Navy, or to the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, or to the secretary of state of the State of his residence. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, and the secretary of state of any State whose citizens may vote under the provisions of this title, receiving such an application, shall promptly transmit any such application to the Commission, and the Commission shall promptly forward an official war ballot to the person requesting the same. The application may be in any form, but for the convenience of persons entitled to vote under this title the Commission shall prepare a convenient form of application, and distribute the same through the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, to the various stations and ships and localities where persons entitled to vote under this title may be located, such distribution to be made before June 1, 1944.

"(b) Any person voting under the provisions of this title shall privately mark the ballot, place it in the official inner envelope, and securely seal the same. He shall then fill in and subscribe the oath printed upon the official inner envelope. After the oath has been duly attested, the voter shall then place the official inner envelope in the official outer envelope provided for the return of the ballot to the Commission and shall deliver it to a person designated by proper authority to receive executed ballots for transmission to the Commission.

"(c) Any commissioned, noncommissioned, or petty officer not below the rank of sergeant or its equivalent in the armed forces of the United States and any member of the merchant marine of the United States designated for this purpose by the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration is authorized to administer and attest such oaths as are required by this title. All such oaths shall constitute prima facie evidence that the voter is qualified to vote, unless the statements contained in such oath indicate the contrary.

"ADMINISTRATION

"Sec. 7. (a) The Secretaries of War and Navy shall be responsible for the administra-

tion of this title with respect to members of the armed forces and civilians attached to and serving with the armed forces and entitled to vote thereunder. The Administrator of the War Shipping Administration shall be responsible for the administration of this title with respect to members of the merchant marine of the United States entitled to vote thereunder.

"(b) In each year in which a general election for Senators and Representatives in Congress is to be held, the Commission shall furnish well in advance of the election an adequate number of copies of explanations of voting procedures to the Secretaries of War and Navy and to the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration.

"LISTS OF CANDIDATES

"Sec. 8. The secretary of state of each State shall furnish the Commission such information as the Commission shall request for compiling a list of candidates and their parties in any general election for President and Vice President or for Senators and Representatives in Congress. The Commission shall transmit to the Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, at such times as it deems to be appropriate for balloting under this title, lists of candidates compiled from the information so received, even if incomplete. The Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration shall, in ample time for balloting under this title, transmit such lists to all units of the armed forces and to members of the merchant marine of the United States, to the extent that such transmission is practicable and compatible with military operations. Incomplete lists of candidates so furnished, or failure to furnish such lists, shall be no bar to balloting under the provisions of this title. No list of candidates furnished under this title shall include information as to a candidate other than his name, address, party affiliation, and office for which nominated.

"DISTRIBUTION AND COLLECTION OF BALLOTS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND OTHERS

"Sec. 9. (a) The Secretaries of War and Navy, insofar as practicable and to the fullest extent compatible with military operations, shall cause explanations of voting procedure and lists of candidates to be distributed to members of the armed forces and to civilians attached to and serving with the armed forces and entitled to vote under this title, in ample time to insure an opportunity to vote in general elections under this title and shall cause executed ballots to be collected and transmitted to the Commission.

"(b) Wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, the appropriate commanding officer shall be required--

"(1) to cause lists of candidates to be posted and otherwise made available at conspicuous and convenient places as soon as received and to cause copies of explanations of voting procedure and all other necessary information to be furnished to members of his unit and civilians attached to and serving with such unit and entitled to vote under this title;

"(2) to cause executed ballots to be collected and delivered for transmission to the Commission.

"DISTRIBUTION AND COLLECTION OF BALLOTS FOR THE MERCHANT MARINE

"Sec. 10. The Administrator of the War Shipping Administration shall cause explanations of voting procedure and lists of candidates for voting in general elections to be made available to members of the merchant

marine of the United States upon request. The Administrator shall cause executed ballots to be collected and delivered to the Commission or to appropriate representatives of the War and Navy Departments for transmission to the Commission. The Secretaries of War and Navy shall arrange, so far as practicable, for the receipt of such ballots and their transmission to the Commission together with the ballots of members of the armed forces. The Administrator may delegate to the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, with the consent of such Secretary, any function of the Administrator under this title.

"PRIORITIES

"SEC. 11. The Secretaries of War and Navy and other appropriate authorities shall take all steps necessary to give to the transmission and delivery of ballots and communications under this title priority over all unofficial communications and priority over official communications except where, in the judgment of the appropriate military and naval authorities, such priority would interfere with the effective prosecution of the war. Ballots cast outside the United States shall be transmitted by air, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations.

"TRANSMISSION

"SEC. 12. The Commission, upon receiving any ballot cast under this title, shall promptly transmit it to the secretary of state of the State of the voter's residence who shall at an appropriate time transmit it to the appropriate election officials of the district, precinct, county, or other voting unit of the voter's residence. No person other than such appropriate election officials shall open any official outer or inner envelope purporting to contain a ballot cast under this title.

"REPORTS

"SEC. 13. (a) The Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration shall report to the Commission on balloting under this title, including the number of ballots distributed, received, and transmitted to the Commission, together with any comments thereon or explanation thereof.

"(b) The Commission shall prepare a statement of all ballots received and transmitted to the various secretaries of state. Each secretary of state shall prepare a report of all ballots received by him and transmitted to the various election officials, and within 30 days after the last day for counting absentee ballots in any election in which ballots are cast under the provisions of this title, each secretary of state shall transmit such report to the Commission.

"SEC. 14. (a) The functions and powers of the Soldiers' and Sailors' War Ballot Commission under this act shall be administrative only. Nothing in this act shall be construed to confer a right to vote upon any person who does not possess the qualifications prescribed and defined by State law for electors in the State of his residence; and nothing in this act shall be construed to affect the right of any State to prescribe and define the qualifications of electors entitled to vote in elections held in such State and to determine what persons possess such qualifications.

"VALIDITY OF BALLOTS

"(b) The Commission shall have no powers or functions with respect to the determination of the validity of ballots cast under the provisions of this title; such determination shall be made by the duly constituted election officials of the appropriate districts, precincts, counties, or other voting units of the several States. Votes cast under the provisions of this title shall be canvassed, counted, and certified in each State by its proper can-

vassing boards in the same manner, as nearly as may be practicable, as the votes cast within its borders are canvassed, counted, and certified. The qualifications of voters shall be determined in accordance with State law.

"(c) No official war ballot shall be valid if—

"1. the voter has also voted in person or by absentee ballot in accordance with the procedure provided by State law; or

"2. the date of the oath of elector is later than the date of the holding of the election; or

"3. such ballot is received by the appropriate election official of the district, precinct, county, or other voting unit of the State of the voter's residence later than the date of the holding of the election, except that any extension of time for the receipt of absentee ballots permitted by State laws shall apply to ballots cast under this title.

"(d) All ballot envelopes received by a secretary of state at a date or time too late for proper delivery, and all ballot envelopes not delivered to polling places or to the proper officials shall not be opened but shall be endorsed with the date of reception and shall be retained by the secretary until the time has expired for contesting the election, when they shall be destroyed without examination.

"(e) The provisions of this section 14 shall apply both to title I and title II of this act.

"VOTING SAFEGUARDS

"SEC. 15. Every individual concerned with the administration of this title shall take all necessary steps to prevent fraud, to protect voters against coercion of any sort, and to safeguard the integrity and secrecy of ballots cast hereunder.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 16. The provisions of State and Federal law prohibiting offenses against the elective franchise shall apply in the case of elections and voting conducted pursuant to the provisions of this title: *Provided, however*, That no act done in good faith by a member of the armed forces of the United States, in the exercise of his judgment as to what was practicable and compatible with military operations, shall constitute a violation of any such provision of law.

"APPROPRIATE STATE OFFICIALS

"SEC. 17. Wherever, in any State, an official other than the secretary of state is the appropriate State official to carry out any function vested in the secretary of state under this title, the term 'secretary of state' shall mean such other official.

"OFFICIALS AND AGENCIES TO ACT FOR SECRETARY OF STATE

"SEC. 18. Each secretary of state may utilize the services of such State and local officials and agencies for such purposes and to such extent as he may deem appropriate in the exercise of his powers and duties under this title.

"ACT TO BE LIBERALLY CONSTRUED

"SEC. 19. The provisions of this act shall be construed liberally in order to effectuate its purposes.

"TITLE II

"SEC. 201. The Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring, and recommends to the several States the immediate enactment of, appropriate legislation to enable each person absent from the place of his residence and serving in the armed forces of the United States or in the merchant marine of the United States, or serving in the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, or the United Service Organizations outside the United States and attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States, who is eligible to vote in any election district or precinct, to vote by absentee ballot in any

primary or general election held in his election district or precinct in time of war; and in order to afford ample opportunity for such persons to vote for Federal, State, and local officials and to utilize the absentee-balloting procedures of the various States to the greatest extent possible:

"(a) It is recommended that the several States, in order to avoid expense, duplication of effort, and loss of time, shall accept, as applications for absentee ballots under such States' absentee-balloting laws and as applications for registration under such States' election laws, the form of post card (when duly executed by a person to whom this act is applicable) provided pursuant to section 3 of the act of September 16, 1942 (Public Law 712, 77th Cong.), of which some 11,000,000 have been prepared and are available for such purposes, notwithstanding that such post cards refer to the ballot being applied for as an 'official war ballot'.

"The form of the post-card application referred to is as follows:

"-----
"(Date)

"Secretary of state of -----:

"Being on active duty in the armed forces of the United States and desiring to vote in the coming election, I hereby apply for an official war ballot.

"My home address is -----, in the city,
"(Number and street)

town, or village of -----, in the county of -----, in the State of -----, and my voting district or precinct to the best of my knowledge is ----- I desire that the ballot be sent to me at the following address -----

"-----
"(Signed)

"Signature certified by:

"-----
"(To be signed by any commissioned officer)

"Upon the other side of such post card is printed the following:

"FREE

"(Official War Ballot)

"Secretary of state of -----,

"-----
"(City

"-----
"(State)

"The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, are directed to cause such post-card applications to be distributed to persons to whom this act is applicable, outside of the United States not later than June 1, 1944, and within the United States not later than July 1, 1944. If such post-card applications already printed are not sufficient in number to supply the persons to whom this act is applicable, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration to cause to be printed an additional amount of such post-card applications so that all of the persons to whom this act is applicable may be furnished with such application.

"(b) It is recommended that the secretary of state of each of the several States, upon receipt of any such post-card application, promptly forward it to the proper county, city, or other election official or officials in order that the request for an absentee ballot may be acted upon as expeditiously as possible.

"(c) It is recommended that the several States cooperate, to the end that county, city, or other election officials be authorized and instructed, upon receipt of an application made upon such a post card, to mail promptly to the voter making the application, if legally permissible under the laws of the State, a suitable absentee ballot, including therewith a self-addressed envelope for

the use of the voter in returning the ballot and any instructions to govern the use of such ballot and envelope.

"(d) It is recommended, so that the envelope in which the ballot is sent to the voter, and the envelope supplied for the return of the ballot, may be identified by the Post Office Department and other authorities as carrying an election ballot, that there be printed or stamped in a conspicuous place on each such envelope the words 'Official Election Ballot.' It is further recommended that, in the case of States in which no provision is made, either on the envelope or separately, for sending with the absentee ballots a printed form to be used by a voter for the purpose of establishing his legal right to vote, appropriate action be taken to have printed and enclosed with absentee ballots mailed in response to applications received on the post cards hereinbefore referred to, a form for the signature and oath or affirmation of the voter; and it is suggested that a form substantially as follows would be appropriate for such purpose:

"OATH OF ELECTOR FOR VOTING IN THE GENERAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN 1944

"I do hereby swear (or affirm) that—

"(1) I am a citizen of the United States;
 "(2) The date of my birth was _____;
 "(3) For _____ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the State of _____;

"(4) For _____ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the (city, town, or village, if any) of _____, in the county of _____, at (street and number, if any, or rural route) _____;

"(5) I am (check appropriate blank)—

"(a) in the armed forces of the United States _____ () ;

"(b) in the merchant marine of the United States _____ () ;

"(c) in the American Red Cross () , the Society of Friends () , the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots () , or the United Service Organizations () , outside the United States, and attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States; and

"(6) I have not voted and do not intend to vote in this election at any address other than the above; and that I have not received or offered, do not expect to receive, have not paid, offered, or promised to pay, contribute, offered, or promised to contribute to another, to be paid or used, any money or other valuable thing as a compensation or reward for the giving of a vote at this election, and have not made any promise to influence the giving or withholding of any such vote; and that I have not been convicted of bribery or any infamous crime, or, if so convicted, that I have been pardoned or restored to all the rights of a citizen, without restriction as to the rights of suffrage.

"(Voter must write his usual signature here and oath must be administered and attested.)

"Subscribed and sworn to before me this ____ day of _____, 1944.

"(Commissioned, noncommissioned, or petty officer not below the rank of sergeant (or its equivalent), or other person authorized to administer and attest this oath, shall write his name here.)

"(Officer or other person signing above shall print his rank, rating, or title clearly here.)

"(e) It is recommended that, in States where the voters' absentee ballot will not be available for mailing to the voter 45 days prior to the general election in 1944, such States cause to be made such changes in the election laws of their States as will lengthen such time; and that all States waive registration of all men and women in the military service who, by reason of such services, have been deprived of an opportunity to register.

"(f) It is further recommended that the several States, in order to reduce the weight and bulk for air transport of absentee voting material being sent to persons to whom this act is applicable, reduce in size and weight of paper, as much as possible, envelopes, ballots, and instructions for voting procedure.

"SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, respectively, to cooperate with appropriate State officers and agencies in transmitting to and from persons to whom this act is applicable, making application therefor to their several States, such absentee ballots, and envelopes to be used in connection therewith, as may be provided under the laws of the several States for the use of such applicants, and to cooperate in the execution by such applicants of oaths in connection with such ballots.

"(b) Such post cards, ballots, and envelopes, and instructions for voting procedure, including air-mail postage, in the United States mails. The Secretaries of War and Navy, and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, shall take all steps necessary to give to the transmission and delivery of such post cards, ballots, envelopes, and instructions for voting procedure priority over all unofficial communications and priority over official communications except where, in the judgment of the appropriate military and naval authorities such priority would interfere with the effective prosecution of the war. Ballots cast outside the United States shall, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, be transmitted by air.

"(c) As used in this act—

"(1) the term 'United States' used geographically includes only the territorial limits of the several States of the United States and the District of Columbia; and

"(2) the term 'members of the merchant marine of the United States' means persons employed as officers or members of crews of vessels documented under the laws of the United States and persons enrolled for such employment with the United States War Shipping Administration, but does not include those in service or enrolled for service on the Great Lakes or the inland waterways.

"SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall have no powers or functions with respect to the determination of the validity of ballots cast under this title II of this act; such determination shall be made by the duly constituted election officials of the appropriate districts, precincts, counties, or other voting units of the several States. Votes cast under the provisions of title II of this act shall be canvassed, counted, and certified in each State by its proper canvassing boards in the same manner, as nearly as may be practicable, as the votes cast within its borders are canvassed, counted, and certified.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the commission to arrange with the Postmaster General that all absent voters' ballots mailed to members of the armed forces overseas be sent to designated central post offices where they can be properly sorted and given special attention for transmission direct to the units or ships or localities where the addressees are stationed, to the end that they reach their destination at the earliest possible date. It shall further be the duty of the commission to make such arrangements with the Post Office Department that ballots returned from overseas reach the appropriate secretary of state at the earliest possible moment. The Postmaster General of the United States is directed to cooperate in every way with the war ballot commission, the War and Navy Departments, the War Shipping Administra-

tion, and State officials to secure the most complete and the most prompt delivery and return of ballots.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the commission to communicate immediately with State officials and advise them fully with regard to the preparation of State laws in accordance with the recommendations of section 201 hereof, and containing such other features as may be desirable to facilitate the voting provided for in this act.

"TITLE III

"MISCELLANEOUS

"Authorization for appropriations

"SEC. 301. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

Wherever the words "United States War Ballot Commission" appear in the act, they shall be amended to read "Soldiers and Sailors' War Ballot Commission."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment I shall offer tomorrow, and ask to have it printed and lie on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CONFIRMATION OF FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is only one nomination on the executive calendar. It is a nomination in the Foreign Service. I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nomination be considered and confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles E. Hulick, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Foreign Service officer, unclassified, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, February 4, 1944, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 3 (legislative day of January 24), 1944:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Grover Bennett Hill, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers of the Public Health Service for promotion, effective from February 1, 1944:

ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS

John C. Grier
Paul V. Joliet

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY SURGEON

James R. Shaw

PASSED ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY DENTAL SURGEON

William C. Neaf

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY PASSED ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON

Howard K. Wyatt

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 3 (legislative day of January 24), 1944:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Charles E. Hulick, Jr., to be a Foreign Service officer, unclassified, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Paul M. Brown, of the First Methodist Church, Towanda, Pa., offered the following prayer:

O God, our help in ages past, our hope in years to come; we lift our thought this brief moment unto Thee. From the swiftly changing scenes which so often confuse us, we look to One by whom all things are seen and all things known. While a thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, Thou hast not left us as orphans in the midst of the years. In every outreach of our spirits we have felt Thy sure response. In Thee we find the light of all that is true, the strength of all that is good, the glory of all that is beautiful.

Wilt Thou who dost commit unto us the swift and solemn trust of life grant unto us strength and wisdom equal to our tasks. To us whose lives have fallen in the pleasant places of this beloved land grant an increasing sense of stewardship. Bless especially with the spirit of understanding and faith these who carry the heavy burden of public office in this high hour—the President, the Cabinet, the Congress of these United States.

May Thy blessing rest upon our free institutions that this land may remain forever the home of liberty. Thou who knowest the ends of the earth and yet art familiar with every one of Thy children, abide with our friends and loved ones in distant places. May the crimson tide of

sacrifice be not in vain. We fervently pray that the day may come when all men shall invoke Thy name; when all created in Thine image shall recognize their brotherhood. In paths beyond our human eye to discover redeem us from strife and chaos and ordain from our warring world Thy beauty and Thy peace.

And now may the words of our mouths and the meditation of our hearts be acceptable unto Thee, O Lord, our Rock and our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of War.
3. Office of Defense Transportation.
4. Selective Service System.
5. United States Civil Service Commission.
6. United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the remarks of Rt. Rev. Fulton Sheen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERRITT]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. O'TOOLE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCKENZIE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Lynn, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER] may be permitted to speak for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short newspaper article by Frank R. Kent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial from Collier's weekly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and also I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the Governor of the State of Vermont and a couple of editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PLUMLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by myself on January 22.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief article by Archbishop Curley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

RAYMOND CLAPPER

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Raymond Clapper's death removes from the American press one of its most intellectually honest reporters. His ability